

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06824884 2

The  
Gordon Lester Ford  
Collection  
Presented by his Sons  
Worthington Chauncy Ford  
and  
Paul Leicester Ford  
to the  
New York Public Library.

Cotter  
ZHIK







THE  
MASS AND RUBRICS

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH,

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH.

WITH NOTES AND REMARKS.

BY THE

REV. JOHN ROGERSON COTTER, A. M.,  
RECTOR OF INNISHIANNON; AUTHOR OF "QUESTIONS ON  
ST. MATTHEW AND OTHER GOSPELS."

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

NEW YORK:

D. APPLETON & CO., 200 BROADWAY

PHILADELPHIA:

GEO. S. APPLETON, 148 CHESNUT ST.

CINCINNATI:—DERBY, BRADLEY, & CO., 113 MAIN ST.

M DCCC XLVI

EPTB

THE CROWN IN THE MARK

1870-1871

## INTRODUCTION.

---

MANY are the controversial works describing the differences between the Roman Catholic and Protestant creeds, which have been sent forth by the press ; but it has frequently occurred to me as strange, that no work (at least I have been unable to discover any) has been published, descriptive of the forms and services of the Roman Mass. This appeared to me to be an important “desideratum.” There are partial translations, published for the use of the Roman Catholic laity ; but nothing has been done to give a translation of, and comments upon, the entire Mass with its Rubrics. This want I have endeavored to supply, convinced that the plan is most important, and the proposed object most valuable, as the parties interested have the means before them of detecting

any errors or misstatements, which, if they exist, are unintentional.

To be understood by the lowest capacity has been a chief object, and hence, plainness in language and composition has been particularly studied. An endeavor has also been made, to avoid all harsh and irritating language, being fully impressed that it is not by such, truth ought to be maintained. Should any expression met with in the following pages appear to militate against this declaration, I have only again to assert, such is unintentional on my part, and that nothing is farther from my wishes than to give offence.

JOHN R. COTTER.

May 1, 1845.

THE  
MASS AND RUBRICS  
OF  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

---

MY DEAR ROMAN CATHOLIC BRETHREN—

IT has frequently excited the astonishment of many, why, in these days of scriptural light, you should remain apparently so attached to the religion of the Church of Rome ; that you, many of whom are intelligent and well-informed persons, should, while you profess to be servants of the Lord Jesus Christ, hold sentiments and doctrines opposed to those which are clearly and plainly set forth in God's inspired word, by our Lord himself and his holy Apostles, whom you profess to reverence. You are taught to value yourselves upon belonging to the most ancient Church, which you are also taught is the mistress of all other churches. It is carefully impressed upon you, that every article of faith to which you are required to give assent, comes down to you from the remotest antiquity ; that all other bodies of professing Christians are only upstarts and holders of novelties ; and that you are fully justified, as belonging to a church which cannot err, in looking down upon all others with contempt. You are taught to inquire triumphantly of us Protestants—"Where was your religion before Luther ?" implying that the doctrines we hold and the principles we profess, were only known in the Christian world since the time of Luther, or little more than three hundred years, and consequently must be mere modern inventions.

You are in great ignorance upon this subject. You cannot prove any doctrine held by the Reformed Churches to be a novelty, or less ancient than the times of the Apostles. In the great fundamental truths of the Christian faith, you profess to agree with us; and I trust, with the Divine aid, to show you, that those doctrines upon which your church and ours differ, and which we reject as being inconsistent with, nay, contradictory to, those fundamentals which we in common admit, are those which have been added from time to time by your church, at comparatively modern periods. The mode I shall adopt to establish this position is as follows. I shall translate your own service, which you call the "Mass," into English, and prove to you from the prayers of the Mass itself—First, that it is contradictory to God's own word; Secondly, that it is at variance with the practices of the ancient Christian Church; and, Thirdly, that one part contradicts another, and also contradicts several of your own favorite doctrines. In order to prevent the charge of misrepresentation, I shall bring forward *your own authorities*. Your *own translation* of the Testament, however obscure and corrupt we believe it to be in many places, shall be used.

In the Mass it is intended to celebrate the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, as it is termed, which word signifies "thanksgiving." Our blessed Lord, we learn, by reference to the Gospels, instituted his last supper the night before his crucifixion. We are told by the inspired Evangelists of the mode in which the disciples partook of it—how the Lord Jesus commanded them to do the same for a commemoration of Him. Luke xxii. 19. And we are also informed, Matt. xxviii. 18, how, previous to his ascension, he commanded his disciples to "go and teach all nations to observe all those things which he had commanded them;" and he said, "Lo, I am with you always to the consummation of the world." "All power," said he, "is given to me in heaven and in earth;" thus impressing upon his disciples, that he would exercise his authority upon his church; that he would watch over the pastors and teachers, that they

may only inculcate those doctrines which he taught, and, as Peter says, 1 Epistle, chap. v. verses 2, 4 : "When the Prince of pastors shall appear, such as faithfully feed the flock of God shall receive a never-fading crown of glory."

Let us now compare the ceremonies of the Mass and the Supper of our Lord. Such are the differences, so striking are the dissimilarities, that it is impossible to say with truth that the one is a representation of the other. If I can prove this assertion, how can it be said that you comply with the commands of our Lord in its celebration ? And here I may well complain of the additional labor imposed upon me of rendering your prayers and formularies into English, in order to be understood by you ; and is it not a strange employment for me to endeavor to make you understand the meaning of your own Liturgies ? You cannot plead antiquity for the use of the Latin in your public service. If you wish for the ancient original language, you should adopt the Syriac or Hebrew, as one of these was the language spoken by our blessed Lord to his Apostles at the celebration of the last supper. He was addressing persons who understood the language in which he spoke ; but you, who are unacquainted with Latin, know nothing of what the priest is saying. And besides, you have the uniform practice of antiquity against you. There were several ancient Liturgies in various languages from the beginning—St. Cyril's, St. Clement's, St. James's, St. Mark's, St. John Chrysostom's, the Ethiopic, and the Roman. Why was this, but to suit the languages of the several persons who were present at divine worship ? I refer you, upon this subject, to a work of the Roman Church called "A Collection of the principal Liturgies which are used by Greeks and other Schismatics," as your author terms them. All those persons who are here termed schismatics by your church, positively assert that they have had these various Liturgies in their own languages from the times of the Apostles. I mention this only for the purpose of showing you that antiquity gives no sanction to one exclu-

sive Liturgy or language. Origen says, Con. Celsum, lib. viii. p. 402 : "The Grecians use the Greek language in their prayers, and the Romans the Roman, and so every one his own." The popes or bishops of Rome gradually compelled the various European nations who used their own language in the celebration of their public service, to adopt the Roman or Latin. This is fully shown in many parts of church history.

We proceed now to prove from Scripture, that this practice of using a language in the service of the church, not understood by the people, is absolutely forbidden. I refer you to the 14th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul says, verse 8 ; " If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle ? 9 ; So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue plain speech, how shall it be known what is spoken ? for you shall be speaking into the air." Read on the 10-16. " Else if thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned, say Amen to thy blessing, because he knoweth not what thou sayest." Again St. Paul says, verse 19 ; " In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue," a strange tongue. Mark the expression in *the church*—that is, at *public worship*. Now, I propose a simple question to you here—Does your church follow the precept of the Apostle Paul ?—The Saviour saith, " He that heareth you, heareth me"—Luke x. 16 ; and yet, you plainly and openly disregard the command of one of his chosen apostles, who was sent forth to teach and enforce those things which the Lord Jesus himself had spoken. " But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that we have preached, let him be anathema," or accursed.—So says St. Paul—Gal. i. 8. In a note I read in the Douay Testament upon this passage, respecting the use of unknown languages in your public church services, the practice is attempted to be justified by saying, that the Latin, so far from being an unknown tongue, is perhaps the best known tongue in the

world. Is the writer of this note serious in supposing he can make void the command of the apostle by such an assertion? French, or English, or German, is much more extensively spoken and understood by the people in Europe. Latin is not spoken as a living language now. Many among you would rejoice to hear your service in a language you could join in, and repeat the Amen. This, the Apostle says, in the above quotation, you cannot do, not knowing what is said. The other formularies and prayers of your church are also in Latin—baptisms, marriages, extreme unction—by hearing which you are but little edified.

The first thing you do when you attend Mass is to sprinkle yourselves with “holy water,” contained in a stone vessel at your chapel door. In what part of the history of our Lord’s Supper do we find this practice mentioned? Where do the apostles of our blessed Lord sanction it? There were fountains outside the churches, or in the courts, where the people bathed their faces and hands, in token of the purity they should exhibit, when about to join in the public worship of God. We find several of the ancient fathers alluding to this. Chrysostom, in the fourth century, in his 57th Homily, speaks of these fountains as things of common use; and Tertullian also alludes to this custom, chap. II. *De Oratore*, where he asks, “What is the use of going into prayers with washed hands, but with an unclean spirit!” Perhaps this practice was grounded on Hebrews x. 22. In process of time, the original design and custom were changed, and the present practice was introduced of the priest blessing the water, and mixing it with salt to prevent, I suppose, its becoming putrid, and thus teaching you that it was henceforth endued with particular virtues. Challoner, in his “Catholic Christian,” tells us that its use is “to defend those upon whom it is cast from the powers of darkness.” Thus, we find, many of you imagine that you are complying with a most ancient custom, and foolishly attribute such virtue and efficacy to this water, that you even carry it to your houses, and sprinkle it over

you at your private devotion, and use it for many other superstitious purposes. We repeat the question—Where is the sanction of antiquity for doing so, for many hundred years after our blessed Lord? And as for the scriptural authorities, which your Roman Catholic writers bring forward from the Old Testament, Num. v. 17, and xix. 9, they have nothing in either ease to do with your practice.. In the one instance it was drunk—why do not you drink it likewise? and I have often been surprised that you who profess to value it so highly, do not drink it; that by its thus being brought nearer the heart, it might become more efficacious in keeping off the influence of the powers of darkness from that which requires the greatest purification. In the other case, it refers to bathing and purifying the body. See the two passages, and examine for yourselves. The only ancient custom which at all resembles your modern practice, prevailed exclusively in the Heathen Temples; but in the Christian churches we challenge any proof that it prevailed for *several hundred years* after our Lord. It is a comparative novelty, copied from the Heathens.

You also make the sign of the cross when you cast the holy water upon you, and repeat, “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” One fault we find with this practice is, that it leads away your minds from subjects which constitute your true protection, and makes you depend upon external forms of no value; and I am not surprised at your doing so, when Challoner, in his “Catholic Christian,” tells you, when speaking about the use of the sign of the cross, “that it was used of old by the Holy Fathers as an invincible buckler against the devil, and a powerful means to dissipate his illusions.”

Now here are two practices of your church—holy water and “crossing yourselves” to avert the influence of evil spirits—and not a sentence is to be found in the writings of the holy apostles to justify your conduct in either. When we hear our blessed Lord resisting the temptations of the devil, is it by having recourse to such

means? No; he combated the Evil Spirit by reference to the *written* Word of God; and we are informed, Matt. iv. 11, that the devil, thus foiled, left Him; and does not Peter tell us to "resist strong in faith" our adversary the devil, who goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour?—1 Pet. v. 8, 9. Hear St. Paul's advice also, Eph. vi. 11—"Put you on the armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil;" in verse 16—"In all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish *all* the fiery darts of the most wicked one"—mark this expression *all*; verse 18—"By all prayer and supplications, praying at all times in the spirit." Where do you find any of the inspired Apostles recommending "crossings" or "sprinklings with holy water" to keep away evil spirits? Reference to God's Word, prayer, watchfulness, supplications, strength in the faith in Jesus, are the means they taught. Were they less able than you to resist? Upon your principles, you have many advantages of which they knew nothing. Where, then, in these instances, is your boasted antiquity; and how can you condemn those who humbly endeavor to follow only those doctrines and practices which are set forth in God's own Word?

We now suppose you arrived within the church or chapel to hear what you call "Mass." Do you know the meaning of the word? It signifies "a sending away." At the conclusion of your present service, you may remember, the priest says, in Latin, "Ite Missa est." In the Pocket Missal we find the following translation of the words; page 43, edition 1805:—Depart, mass is finished; Missa or Missio, are two Latin words, signifying "sending away." The literal translation is, "Ite—depart, Missa est—it is the sending away." Now, from the *place* where we find this expression, we learn an additional proof of how your church has departed from ancient custom. How you can pride yourselves upon your antiquity is wonderful; as I shall prove that you have but little reason for doing so. The celebration of the Lord's Supper, however changed it

may be now, by your various innovations and alterations, was the foundation of what you call the Mass. And, by examining *where* these words, "Ite missa est," were placed at first, and examining where they are *now*, we shall be assisted, not only in discovering some of the changes which have taken place, but also the original object and design of the church in adopting the expression. Those words were formerly placed at the *beginning* of the Lord's Supper or sacramental service in the Roman liturgy. In primitive times there were two distinct services; to the first, all were indiscriminately admitted; such persons as were not yet baptized, but were waiting for further instruction, and were called *catechumens*, from being *catechized*, as the original word signifies, and those who came from curiosity to learn the nature of the Christian faith; those also who, from having committed some heinous crime, were excluded from partaking of the Eucharist, were admissible to the first service. These several classes, with the sincere and faithful baptized believers, remained together during the prayers and the reading of portions of the Holy Scriptures and the exhortation or sermon. At the conclusion of this service, the officiating deacon pronounced, in a loud voice, "*Ite missa est;*" thus intimating that it was the time for those to depart who were not to participate in the sacred feast. From this circumstance the service which followed was called "Mass," which appellation it has retained until the present day.

You will find this view of the subject sanctioned by Hornihold in his work called "Real Principles of Catholicism," p. 254 to 257, which, in its title-page, contains the expressed approbation of several other Irish Roman Catholic prelates. After giving some other explanations, which appear very forced, and with which the doctor himself does not appear satisfied, he adds, that others are of opinion that the Mass is derived from the Latin word "missio" or "missa," that is, "dismission," or "sending away," because the *catechumens* and others were formerly dismissed, as not being permitted to be

present at this sacrifice, only from the beginning till the offertory ; and the gospel and the sermon being ended, the deacon publicly said, " Ite missa est"—go out all you who are infidels, catechumens, and penitents, for the *Mass* of the faithful is now to begin. Hence at the end of the Mass the words " Ite missa est" are still retained, and now the *modern* meaning is, " depart, for the Mass is ended." The words are now used at the end of the sacramental service in *one sense*; and anciently they were used at the commencement with quite a *different meaning* attached to them.

Consult the writers of antiquity—read over the ancient liturgies or formularies of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which are called by the names of St. Peter, St. Barnabas, St. James, or that of Jerusalem, of which he was first bishop, or that of St. Mark—examine the several liturgies of the early fathers, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and that of St. Ambrose, &c., &c., all of whom flourished not later than the fourth century after our blessed Lord, and you will find no sanction for persons being present at the communion who did not partake of the sacred elements. Justin Martyr, who lived as early as the second century after our Lord, gives the following account of the manner in which the Eucharist was celebrated in his time. My translation is taken from page 44 of the Roman Catholic work, upon the principal ancient liturgies, published in Dublin in the year 1822, by Wogan. " After the believer is baptized, and made one with us, we lead him to the congregation of the brethren, as we call them, and then pour out our souls with great fervor in common prayer, both for ourselves, for the persons baptized, and for all others in every part of the world, that, having embraced the truth, our lives may be as becometh the gospel, and that we may be found doers of the word, and so at length attain eternal salvation. We salute one another with a kiss at the end of prayer : after this, bread and a chalice of wine and water are brought to the bishop, which he takes, and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of

His Son and the Holy Ghost ; and the thanksgiving to God for vouchsafing to make us worthy of these, his creatures, is a prayer of more than ordinary length. When the bishop has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving service, all the people present conclude with an audible voice, saying, ‘Amen,’ which, in the Hebrew language, signifies ‘So be it.’ The eucharistical office being thus performed by the bishop, and concluded with the acclamations of the people, those we call deacons distribute to every one present to partake of this eucharistical bread, and wine, and water, and then they carry it to the absent.” Here, then, you have an account of the mode of administering the Lord’s Supper, so far back as the second century.

I will now quote from higher and more ancient authority, nay, the highest and most ancient of all. Open your Testament, 1 Cor. xi. 23 ; there St. Paul tells us the manner he directed it to be administered, and that not of his own will, but by the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, by whom the Lord’s Supper was originally instituted ; verse 23—“*For I have received of the Lord* that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, 24 ; and giving thanks, broke and said, ‘Take ye, and eat : this is my body which shall be delivered for you. This do for the commemoration of me.’ 25 ; In like manner, also, the chalice, after he had supped, saying, ‘This chalice is the New Testament in my blood—this do ye as often as you shall drink it for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice you show the death of the Lord *until he come*, 27.’\* Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, 28 ; but let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup, 29 ;

\* How entirely at variance this expression is with the doctrine of our Lord being “already come,” when, as the Roman Church teaches, the priest brings and places him upon the altar, and worships him in the form of a wafer !

for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.” In this translation there are some differences from the Protestant version; but my object at present is not to institute a comparison between the relative merits of the two translations, or to prove the erroneousness of yours, but to show you, upon the authority of what *you* admit to be God’s own Word, how the Lord’s Supper was celebrated in the beginning—how his death was commemorated—and to prove to you, by your own admission, how little claim to antiquity or Divine sanction the greater number of those forms and ceremonies possess which have been introduced into the Mass by the Popes of Rome.

I shall now proceed to translate the various prayers of your “Mass,” and shall make such comments as we advance, as may serve to establish my three positions—1, That the “Mass” contains many prayers opposed to God’s Word; 2, To show you that the contents of those prayers, and many of its formularies, are contrary to the practices of the ancient Christian Church; 3, That one part of the Mass contradicts another part, and is also opposed to some of your own favorite tenets.

#### ORDO MISSÆ ; THE ORDER OF THE MASS.

**RUBRIC.**—Sacerdos paratus cum ingreditur ad altare facta illi solita reverentia, signat se signo crucis a fronte ad pectus et clara voce dicit.

**TRANSLATION.**—The priest, being prepared when he approaches to the altar, having made the accustomed reverence to it, signs himself with the sign of the cross, from his forehead to his breast; and, with a loud voice, says—

R.—In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.—Amen.

T.—In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Amen.

R.—Deinde junetis manibus ante pectus incipit antiphonam. Introibo ad altare Dei, *Minister res.* Ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam.

T.—Then, having joined his hands before his breast, he begins the sentences called the Antiphone—I will enter to the altar of God. The minister or clerk answers—To God who giveth joy to my youth.

R.—Postea alternatim cum ministris dicit sequentem Psalmum.

T.—After this he repeats the following Psalm, alternately with the ministers or clerks :—

**PSALMUS 42.**—*Judica me, Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta ; ab homine iniquo et doloso erue me.* M. *Quia tu es Deus fortitudo mea ; quare me repulisti, et quare tristis incedo, dum affligit me inimicus ?* S. *Emitte lucem tuam et veritatem tuam ; ipsa me eduxerunt et adduxerunt in montem sanctum tuam et in tabernacula tua.* M. *Et introibo ad altare Dei ; ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam.* S. *Confitebor tibi in cythara, Deus, Deus meus ; quare tristis es, anima mea, et quare conturbas me.* M. *Spera in Deo, quoniam adhuc confitebor illi, salutare vultus mei, et Deus meus.* S. *Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto.* M. *Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sœcula sœculorum.* Amen.

**PSALM 42.**—*Judge me, O God, and distinguish my cause from the nation that is not holy ; from the unjust and deceitful man deliver me.* M. *Since thou, O God, art my strength, why hast thou cast me off, and why do I go sorrowful, while the enemy afflicteth me.* Priest. *Send forth thy light and thy truth ; they have conducted me and brought me to thy holy mount, and unto thy tabernacles.* M. *And I will go to the altar of God, to God who giveth joy to my youth.* Priest. *I will praise Thee upon the harp, O God, my God.* Why art Thou so sad, O my soul ! and why dost thou disquiet me ? M. *Hope in God, for I will still praise Him : the salvation of my countenance, and my God.* Priest. *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.*

M. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

R.—Sacerdos repetit Antiphonam. Introibo ad altare Dei. M. Ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam.

T.—The priest repeats the Antiphone. I will go unto the altar of God. Res. To God who giveth joy to my youth.

R.—Signat se dicens. Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini. Res. Qui fecit cælum et tellus.

T.—He signs himself with the sign of the cross, saying—Our help is in the name of the Lord. Res. Who made heaven and earth.

R.—Deinde junctis manibus, profunde inclinatus facit confessionem.

T.—Then having joined his hands, and bowing lowly, he makes the confession.

R.—In missis defunctorum et in missis de tempore, a dominica passionis usque ad sabbatum sanctum exclusive, omittitur Psalmus “Judica me Deus;” cum “Gloria Patri” et repetitio Antiphonæ sed dicto “In nomine Patris.” “Introibo” et “adjutorium” fit confessio ut sequitur.

T.—In masses for the dead and in masses during Passion week, the Psalm commencing with “Judge me, O God,” also the “Glory be to the Father,” and the repetition of the Antiphone, are omitted; but having said “In the name of the Father,” &c., the Introibo and the adjutorium, Confession is made as follows:—

R.—Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, beatae Mariæ semper Virgini, beato Michaeli Archangelo, beato Johanni Baptista, sanctis Apostolis Petro et Paulo, omnibus sanctis, et vobis fratres, (vel tibi Pater,) quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo, et opere, (percudit sibi pectus ter dicens :) mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. Ideo precor beatam Mariam semper Virginem, beatum Michaelum Archangelum, beatum Johannem Baptis-

tam, sanctos Apostolos Petrum et Paulum, omnes sanctos, et vos fratres, (vel te Pater,) orare pro me ad Dominum Deum nostrum.

T.—I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever a virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, brethren, (or to you, Father,) that I have sinned exceedingly, both in thought, word, and deed, (he here strikes his breast three times,) through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. Therefore, I beseech the blessed Mary, ever a virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and you brethren, (or you Father,) to pray to our Lord God for me.

**MINISTRI RESPONDENT. THE MINISTERS OR CLERKS ANSWER.**

Misereatur tui omnipotens Dei, et dimissis peccatis tuis, perducat te ad vitam æternam.

T.—May Almighty God have mercy upon you, and, forgiving all your sins, bring you to everlasting life.

R.—Sacerdos dicit "Amen," et erigit se.

T.—The priest says "Amen," and raises himself up.

R.—Deinde ministri repetunt confessionem, et ubi a sacerdote dicebatur "Vobis fratres," et "vos fratres," a ministris dicitur "tibi, Pater" et "te Pater."

T.—Then the ministers repeat the confession, and where it is said by the priest, "To you, brethren," and "you, brethren," the ministers or clerks say, on the part of the people, "To you, O Father," and "you, Father;" meaning the priest.

We now challenge the Church of Rome to prove that there was any such form of confession, any such prayer used in the Church for one thousand years after our blessed Lord. The prayer is an innovation containing doctrines unknown to the ancient Church. There is, in the first place, confession to the saints who are in

glory. You are not content with confession to God, but you also introduce a form, for which no warrant can be produced either from the word of God or from antiquity, and then, not satisfied with confessing to them, you call on them to "pray to the Lord our God for you." Now it will perhaps appear strange to you to hear that even your Roman Church does not consider the invocation of saints as *essential*. Milner, in his "End of Controversy"—a standard polemical book on the Roman Catholic side—speaking on this subject, says, Letter 33, part 3:—"The Council of Trent, which was held only three hundred years ago and since the Reformation, barely teaches that 'it is *good and profitable* to invoke the prayers of the saints,' hence our divines infer that there is no positive law of the Church incumbent on all her children to pray to the saints." So that you see it is not considered essential. We, Protestants, reject the practice because it is not a primitive custom, and above all, not sanctioned by God's word; nay, we shall show that we are specially warned against the practice.

Roman Catholics justify themselves in doing so—mark, we only speak of invoking their *help* or *intercession*; for, as to *confessing to them*, we really know not upon what *rational* grounds such a practice is founded—by the following arguments:

1. That God is such a glorious and almighty Being, that it would be the height of presumption in us to approach Him without a mediator, and hence, that it is of the greatest consequence to have the blessed saints in heaven, to offer up, and advocate the subject matter of our prayers. They argue, secondly, that the mother of our Lord according to the flesh, must naturally be supposed to possess great influence over her son, and that our prayers presented by her, and accompanied with her intercession, must produce a greater effect upon him, than if offered up unaccompanied with such recommendation. They also say, thirdly, that if it be useful, and sanctioned by the Scriptures, to solicit the prayers of the saints upon earth—Ephes. vi. 18, 19;

James v. 16—it must be infinitely more important and valuable to obtain the assistance of those who are in heaven.

I have fairly and impartially stated the chief arguments used by you in favor of this practice. We assert that this difference among Roman Catholic divines, as alluded to above, in asserting the universal obligation of soliciting the intercession of the saints in heaven, would be sufficient to justify Protestants from abstaining from the practice, even supposing they were influenced by no other reasons; but, my dear brethren, many causes, derived both from Scripture and antiquity, prevent our doing so. I shall endeavor to answer your arguments in succession.

1. Your Church tells you "that God is such a holy Being that it would be too presumptuous for us, miserable sinners as we are, to approach without a mediator." Blessed be the wisdom and the mercy of God, he has not left us without the means of knowing what his will is. Our blessed Lord, when he commanded his disciples to teach those things which he taught them, supplied us with means for ascertaining what those things were. He promised the Holy Ghost the Comforter, who was to come to them, after he was removed to his Father's right hand, as we say in the Apostles' Creed, and taught by the Apostle Paul, Heb. i. 3, 4. 1 Peter iii. 22 and Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxii. 69. Our Lord told them, "The Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name. He will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said unto you," John xiv. 26. Again, our Lord says, "And you shall give testimony because you are with me from the beginning," John xv. 27. Again he says, "But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come he will teach you all truth," John xvi. 13. Nothing can be more express and plain than what our Lord says: "If any man hear my words and keep them not, I do not judge him, for I come not to judge the world but to save the world. He that despiseth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word

that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day," John xii. 47, 48.

Thus, the Holy Scriptures—books written by God's inspired servants, who were prevented by the Holy Ghost from setting down any thing but the truth—as the Psalmist expresses it, were to serve as "a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our paths;" Psalm cxix. 115. Surely our blessed Lord is sufficient authority upon this subject. We hear him saying in his sermon on the mount, Matt. vii. 8, 9; "What man is there among you of whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone, or if he ask of him a fish, will he reach him a serpent? If you, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that *ask him*." What greater encouragement can we require than this invitation. Did our blessed Lord when asked by his disciples to teach them to pray, desire them to have recourse to the intercession of saints and angels to present their petitions to God? No—he taught them to go at once to their Father; he taught them to call him by that endearing title—that though he was in heaven and removed to an infinite degree above them, still they were to look upon him as their Father. Instructing us to consider God as a Father, reconciled to us through our Lord Jesus Christ. Mark the expression—"ask him." To ask him *directly* without any other mediation than that which our Lord has supplied in himself. Where is the necessity of saints in heaven, or angels to interfere? Must not an earthly father be considered harsh and cruel if it be necessary for other persons to intercede with him in behalf of his own child, his own flesh and blood, to induce him not to suffer that child to starve? There are such instances to be found among us, but, thank God, they are but few, though we *are evil*. Can we doubt, then, whether, as our Lord himself inquires, we need any further intercessors, any further interference with our heavenly Parent, whom we are instructed to call and consider our Father, to induce him to listen with favor to the petitions of his

children, for whose sake his blessed Son shed his blood upon the cross! Away, brethren, with such doubts; for, as our Lord says, John iii. 16, "God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish but may have life everlasting."

2. The second argument which Roman Catholics bring forward to justify their soliciting the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, is, "that the mother of our Lord according to the flesh, must naturally possess great influence with her son, and that our prayers presented by her, and accompanied with her intercession, must be more successful than if offered up by ourselves alone." Protestants deny the force of this argument in reference to the way God deals with the world as set forth in his revealed word. They also deny its force upon principles prevailing among men. If any of us who profess to be persons of truth and honesty, make a promise, say to pay our servants or workmen their wages, would those workmen be justified in applying to our mother, supposing her to be living, or to any of our friends, to entreat them to interfere with us, and to induce us to keep our engagements made to them. Should we be pleased at such interferences--should we not have reason to conclude that our workmen distrusted our honor, and had greater confidence in that of our mother or our friends? Romanists may here say that though this reasoning be just, provided we did not repeatedly offend, yet, lest the Divine patience and forbearance may be exhausted by renewed transgression, it is more wise and prudent to seek after such intercessors. This argument, Protestants rejoин, applies not to the relation in which man stands to God. The Son of God, Jesus Christ, is the only means by which a sinner can be reconciled to God. It is by his blood alone our sins are washed away. He paid the ransom of *all* sins, both original and actual, however often repeated, and the Church, as the Roman Catholic Catechism of Butler states, in support of this view, offers, to satisfy the offended justice of God for our sins, the merits of

Christ, which are *infinite* and *superabundant*.\* The Apostle John, 1 Epis. ii. 6, confirms this fundamental doctrine where he says—"If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just." St. Paul, also, tells us, 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God and one mediator of God and man, the man Jesus Christ." Why, after this declaration of the inspired apostles, should we have recourse to any other? —and St. Paul says, Heb. vii. 25—more fully to confirm and explain what he had been teaching, "He is able to *save for ever* them that come unto God by *himself*, always living to make intercession for us." And Jesus himself tells us, John xvi. 23; "If you ask the Father any thing in my name, he will give it to you."

Do you believe the assurance here given by the holy Apostles and our Lord Jesus Christ? If you suppose that our blessed Lord and his inspired apostles are safe guides and sufficient teachers, why have you recourse to the intercession of any other? Is there *any sin* for which the blood of Jesus cannot atone? Is there any more merciful than he, any more kind, more compassionate? Surely he became man like unto us, save only as to sin—of whom, as St. Paul says, "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest that hath passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession, for we have not a High Priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities, but one, tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin. Let us go therefore with confidence to the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid."<sup>†</sup> Heb. iv. 14, 16; see also Heb. ii. 17, 18.

We next consider the third reason advanced to justify the invocation of saints. Your teachers assert, "if it be lawful to solicit the prayers of our friends upon earth,

\* The concluding part of this answer is sadly opposed to the beginning.

<sup>†</sup> This is one of many passages in your Testament, which are translated, *wilfully, obscurely*; so that, if possible, the meaning of God's word may be withheld from you when you read it.

and ask their intercession in our behalf"—which is plainly sanctioned in various parts of God's word—"why should we not seek the prayers of the saints in heaven?" Great, indeed, is the difference. How can we ascertain whether they are in the place you call "purgatory," or in heaven? How can they know our thoughts? Discerning the thoughts constitutes one of the attributes of the godhead. "*I am he,*" saith the Saviour, "*who searcheth the reins and the heart,*" Rev. ii. 23, as much as to tell us it was his special attribute as God, and not communicated to any other. Protestants solicit their Christian friends to pray for them; but it is only when they are present, or if absent, by writing—"Confess your sins, therefore, one to another, and pray for one another, for the continual prayer of a just *man* availeth much," James, v. 26. Mark the expression *man*, not *dead saint*. Thus we see that our prayers must be *reciprocal*, as if all, in one sense, were equal in the sight of God: but this principle of equality, or reciprocity, is entirely lost sight of in the Roman practice, as none of you would think of praying for one of the saints of heaven in turn, though such is your most inconsistent practice in the Mass.

Again, your teachers inquire, if the one practice be allowed, why not the other? It is plain, if the Holy Spirit permitted both, permission would be expressed for both; but *will worship*, or worship of men's invention, is plainly and expressly forbidden, "*the adoring or worshipping of angels, walking in things we have not seen, not holding the Head,*" namely, Jesus our only Mediator, Col. ii. 18. And we see the sad consequences of your not following the rule of God's word. Your church teaches you to address the saints and angels, as if they were Gods. You talk of their merits in the sight of God, when God's word tells us that our Lord Jesus Christ declares, "*that after having done every thing that has been commanded, still we are but unprofitable servants, having done that only which was our duty to do,*" Luke xvii. 10; and for which we have no right to demand a recompense.

The Holy Spirit, it would appear, foreknew the dangerous errors to which professors of the gospel were liable, and how truly remarkable it appears, that we should find so many passages in the Gospels cautioning us against the very errors into which your church has fallen. "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," exclaimed a certain woman, as recorded in the gospel. Did our Lord encourage her in these notions respecting his mother's high dignity, as taught in the Roman church? "Nay," said he, "yea, *rather* blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it," Luke xi. 26, 27. Mark here, the special blessing pronounced upon those who hear, not the voice of your church, but "the word of God, and obey it." Again, we find, as recorded, Mat. xii. 46, that one said unto our Lord as he was speaking to, and teaching the people, "Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee." According to the modern Romish doctrine, the moment he received the message he would have hastened to his mother, and complied with her request; but how did he act? He answered him that told him, "Who is *my* mother, and who are *my* brethren?" and stretching forth his hand to his disciples, he said, "Behold *my* mother and *my* brethren, for whosoever shall do the will of my Father, which is in heaven, the same is *my* brother, and sister, and mother."

Here we find two important doctrines taught: one, that relationship, according to the flesh, confers no influence over our Lord, who, by the way, *never called her, mother*, in any part of Scripture—that the only relationship he acknowledges in his mediatorial capacity, is that of his Father, and next, that, doing the will of God his Heavenly Father, through divine grace, is the only evidence to show that a spiritual relationship has been obtained. Again, when he was about to leave this world, we find him addressing his mother, who was standing beneath the cross, and John, the beloved disciple, and saying to her, "Woman, behold thy son;" John xix. 25, as much as to imply, that the relationship, according to the flesh, was about to terminate,

and that a final separation in that respect was to take place; and in saying to John "behold *thy* mother," it seems clearly shown by our Lord, that he wished to disown all those vain notions respecting her power and influence over him *as his mother*, which gradually crept into the church. It is also worthy of remark, that we hear nothing more of the blessed Virgin, except a brief mention of her in Acts i. 14. None of the apostles speak of her in their Epistles, though, according to the Roman Catholic faith, the gospel is but very imperfectly preached, if her power and influence are not most prominently set forth.

She says, "all generations shall call me blessed," and Elizabeth says, "Blessed art thou among women;" but this proves no special privilege conferred upon her, for our Lord, in one of the passages quoted above declares—"Rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." He also says, Mat. v. 2: "*Blessed are the poor in spirit.*" Jael, the wife of Heber, was pronounced "blessed *above* women," Judges v. 2; and Judith was also declared to be blessed of Almighty God for evermore, in the book called after her name, Judith xv. 10, and which you receive into your canon, and consequently admit as authority. Your church carries her errors to such a height, that you repeat, when "telling your beads," ten "Hail Marys" to one "Our Father." Surely if that blessed saint could hear you, such vain and absurd repetitions of the same words—condemned by our Lord, Mat. vi. 7—must appear as if you were only mocking her. If you addressed an earthly king or queen in that apparently senseless manner, certainly such an impression would be produced.

One precept we find recorded, as given by the Virgin, and why is it not obeyed by you who profess to reverence her so much? "Whatsoever he saith unto you do ye;" John ii. 5. She tells you to look to her Son Jesus, to follow his commands, as revealed in the written word, and not her own. Jesus, when she interfered about the wine, said, "Woman, what is it to me and to thee, mine hour is not yet come?" The note

in the Douay Testament truly says, that “our Lord’s object, in this reply, was to give a lesson to his disciples, that in the functions of their ministry they should not be put out of their way by any consideration of flesh and blood.” His mother appeared to be conscious of this, and therefore directed the servants to take their instructions from *him alone*; and, surely, this is our safest way to act. Where does Jesus command you to confess your sins to her, and to the saints and angels, not merely asking their intercession, the danger of which we have clearly proved from God’s word, but confessing your sins to them, making them equal to God, as if it were against *them* you had transgressed.

Consult the ancient liturgies; the only confessions we find there, are to God and the several persons of the Blessed Trinity. The Apostle Paul, Col. ii. 18, cautions you against paying religious worship to angels, influenced by *false* humility, as supposing that God is too great to be *immediately* addressed, and not holding Christ as the Head, the only Mediator. And, again, we find him speaking in the spirit of prophecy, 1 Tim. ii. 5, warning them respecting the invocation of departed saints.

Look to 1 Tim. iii. 2, where he says—a bishop is to be the husband of one *wife*, and to rule his *children* well, and verse 12, deacons, also; but, in chapter 4, verse 1, he says, that great changes will take place in the latter times—“Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having their conscience seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats.” This is a most remarkable passage. The apostle speaks of the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy in chapter 3; and here, in the commencement of the fourth, he says, that the Spirit expressly saith, or foretells, that in the *last times* such permission is to be withheld, and also speaks of the forbidding of meats, as your church does upon particular days, thus calling the abstaining from flesh “fasting,” when it is most remarkable, that upon the only occasions when our Lord fed the multi-

tudes, he gave them *bread and fish*, thus plainly rebuking the erroneous practice of your church: for surely you cannot say, that when our Lord was thus feeding the multitudes he was causing them to fast. "I will not send them away *fasting*," said our blessed Lord, "lest they faint in the way." Mat. xv. 32.

The Apostle also says, "that in latter times some are to depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils"—thus asserting that their doing so is a departure from the true faith. The original in the Latin vulgate, from whence your English translation is made, is "doctrines of demons"—the rendering of which, by the word "devils," does not convey the sense of the passage, or the meaning of the Apostle. By referring to various authors, you will find "demons" mean either good or bad spirits. Demons, according to the theology of the Gentiles or heathens, were middle powers between the sovereign gods and mortal men; and by consulting various passages of holy Scripture, where this word is used, you will find its plural translated by the word "gods," as well as by the word "devils," Acts xvii. 18, 1 Cor. x. 14, 20, 21, Rev. ix. 20. Thus we learn that the apostle, by divine inspiration, is cautioning those whom he addresses, against the worship *concerning demons*, or of any *intermediate* powers between God and man, and, speaking in the spirit of prophecy, plainly declares that *this heresy will prevail*, as we say it does, in your church. Epiphanius, one of the fathers of the church, who lived in the fourth century, gives the same interpretation to this passage, and quotes it against the Collyridians, ancient heretics, so called from offering cakes, as the Greek word signifies, to the blessed Virgin, and calling her the *Queen of Heaven*,\* one of those titles which the Roman Church of the present day gives to her. He says, "she is to be honored and respected, but not to be adored or worshipped." This is admitted by Du-

\* The ancient idolaters, as mentioned by Jer. xliv. 17, 18, were condemned for burning incense to one of their false goddesses, whom they called by this identical title of "*Queen of Heaven*."

pin, an eminent Roman Catholic writer, vol. I., page 297, folio ed. 1723. Numberless other passages can be selected from the early fathers of the church to the same effect.

We find also a decree of the council of Laodicea, held about the year of our Lord 368, against those who forsake the true worship of the one God, and follow the idolatrous worship of angels, canon 35; and you may also learn, by referring to the ancient liturgies, that the apostles and saints, instead of being *prayed to* and *confessed to*, are nowhere confessed *to*, but are prayed *for* in several—the blessed Virgin herself not excepted, but expressly prayed for by name; and in your Latin “Mass” we shall show that you continue this most ancient corrupt practice of praying *for* the saints.

To prevent any mistake as to the reason of my quoting any of the fathers of the early church, you must understand that I do it only for the purpose of showing, by their evidence, what the belief of the church was at that particular period when they lived. As to attribute any decisive authority to them, it would be absurd, because they frequently contradict themselves, and frequently each other. Their works have been also corrupted and interpolated in many important places, as your own writers admit. The same reasoning will apply to the ancient liturgies—they were gradually corrupted, and doctrines admitted, not to be found in the word of God. If we look for truth, let us go to the holy scriptures, which have come down to us pure and unadulterated, guarded by Christ, the true Head of the church. Surely it is foolish, as well as sinful in the highest degree, to leave the teaching of God himself, as set forth by his inspired apostles, and to follow after the sayings of uninspired and fallible men, in opposition to his own revealed word. “You err,” said our Lord to the Sadducees, “not knowing the scriptures;” Matt. xx. 29. If we look for pure water, is it not more natural to expect to find it at the fountain-head, than in the streams which flow at a distance, which are subject to every defilement?

But the “confiteor” contains other matters of grave importance. You who do not understand Latin, are not perhaps aware, that you not only confess to God and to the saints, and to Michael the archangel, but also *to the priest*, where you say in the confiteor, “et tibi Pater”—“and to you, O Father;” and strange also to say, when the priest repeats the “confiteor” or “confession,” when he comes to the same place, he says “et Vobis Fratres,” and “to you, brethren;” so he confesses to you, and you to him. Thus literally fulfilling, so far as the priests and you are concerned, the command of St. James v. 16, “confess your sins one *to another*, and *pray one for another*,” and this you do, for, towards the conclusion of the “confiteor” or “confession,” you call upon the priest to *pray for you*, and the priest calls on you to *pray for him*.

Now, Challoner, in his Catholic Christian, admits this to be the case. He says, page 73, “our adversaries object against this form of confession, because therein we confess our sins to the saints, as if this was giving them an honor which belongs to God alone, not considering that the confessing of our sins to any one, so far from being an honor peculiar to God, is what we are directed in Scripture to do one to another, James v. 16; and accordingly in that very form which we call the confiteor, we not only confess our sins to God and to his saints, but the priest also confesses to the people, and the people to the priest.” After what has been before stated, you can appreciate the value of this reasoning in favor of confessing to the saints and angels. The truth is, upon this principle the saints should confess to you in turn; and if they pray for you, you are called upon to pray for them. No passage in scripture is more opposed to your present practices of private confession to your priest, or your public confession to saints and angels, or your asking them to pray for you, without their confessions to you, and your prayers for them in turn. We are thus furnished with valuable *incondemnation* respecting the primitive mode of confession, *they &c* the meaning attached by the ancient Church to this

passage of St. James. It is an acknowledgment that its present application to sanction private, or auricular confession, was then unknown, and consequently, that private confession of each particular sin to a priest, was not then, as you are now taught to believe, essential to qualify the penitent for receiving the blessed Eucharist.

Take up your own Bibles, and refer to the passages\* quoted by your Roman Catholic Church, in support of private confession to a priest being essential in order to obtain forgiveness from God, and you will find that they, as well as every other passage in the Bible upon the subject, refer to *public*, not to *private* confession to a priest of *individual sin*. And you may learn, also, from ecclesiastical history, that for more than eight hundred years, such was the general practice of the Church, and this is plainly and conclusively proved by what follows in the "mass" itself—for immediately after the confiteor, there is an absolution pronounced by the priest—"signat se signo crucis dicens"—He signs himself with the sign of the cross, and says—"Indulgentiam absolutionem et remissionem peccatorum nostrorum tribuat nobis omnipotens et misericors Dominus"—May the omnipotent and merciful Lord grant us indulgence, absolution and remission of our sins. The Rubric then says—"Postea sacerdos junctis manibus facit absolutionem dicens. Miseriatur vestri Omnipotens Deus et dimissis peccatis vestris perducat vos ad vitam eternam." The translation of which is, "After this the priest, his hands being joined together, 'facit absolutionem,' gives or makes the *absolution*, saying—May the Almighty God be merciful to you, and, forgiving all your sins, bring you to life everlasting." Now this absolution is the same as that used at private con-

\* Extract from table of controversies at the end of Douay Testament upon the word "confession of sins"—Numbers viii. 6, 7; Matt. iii. 6, Acts xix. 18, St. James v. 16. "The obligation of confession is gathered from the judiciary power of binding and loosing, forgiveness, and retaining sins, given to the pastors of Christ's church—St. Matt. xviii. 18; St. John xx. 22, 23." What authority do these passages give to confession of sins to *dead saints*?

fession. How is it that it possesses no virtue when repeated and given *publicly at Mass* after a public confession, and that it acquires all its efficacy by being repeated *in private*? According to your views, then, I will assume that you make your public confession, and that you do so with a sincerely penitent heart, and that you obtain the absolution given by the priest; for what purpose then serves private confession? By what authority does your Church, with the greatest inconsistency, virtually pronounce that this public absolution is of no value, and that this entire confession and absolution are but a form, and that a useless one?

Private confession of particular sins to a priest as essential to obtain forgiveness of God, is but a modern invention of your Church, to extend her power over the consciences of her members, and thus to keep up that spiritual thraldom which she has endeavored to lay them under. Public confession was, in the beginning, made only to God, and not to saints and angels. Such was the primitive practice, and long antecedent to your modern system. See the manifest anxiety of your Church rulers to keep the knowledge of these acts from your people. In many of your manuals or missals for the use of the laity, this confession and absolution is not given at length, in order, as I suppose, to prevent your discovering that confession is made to the priest, "et tibi Pater," and "to you, O Father," and that the absolution is *identically the same* as that used after private confession.

The Mass then goes on—"Et inclinatus prosequitur." The priest bowing down, proceeds and says, "Deus tu conversus vivificabis nos." Thou, O God, being now favorable to us wilt enliven or refresh us. Answer, "Et plebs tua lætabitur in te," and thy people will rejoice in thee—"ostende nobis Domine misericordiam tuam." Oh! Lord, show thy mercy upon us. Answer—"et salutare tuum da nobis," and grant us thy salvation—"Domine exaudi orationem meam." Lord, hear my prayer. Answer—"et clamor meus ad te veniat," and let my cry come unto thee—"Dominus vo-

biscum," Lord be with you—" et cum spiritu tuo," and with thy spirit.

R.—Et extendens ac jungens manus clara voce dicit " oremus" et ascendens ad altare dieit secreto.

T.—And the priest extending and then joining his hands, says with a loud voice, Let us pray, and going up to the altar, repeats secretly to himself—

R.—Aufer a nobis quæsumus Domine, iniquitates nostras, ut ad sancta sanctorum, puris mereamur mentibus introire. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—Take away from us we beseech thee, O Lord, our iniquities, that we may be worthy to enter with pure minds into the Holy of Holies, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

R.—Deinde manibus junctis super altare inclinatus dicit.

T.—Then bending or bowing over the altar with joined hands the priest says—

R.—Oramus te Domine per merita sanctorum tuorum (*osculatur altare in medio*,) quorum reliquia hic sunt, et omnium sanctorum, ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea. Amen.\*

T.—We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints, (the priest here kisses the altar in the middle,) whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive all my offences.

Here we have two short prayers, and the contents of one of them supplies us with some fresh serious charges against your Church. The first prayer is said *in secret*

\* The origin of this practice of having the bones or relics of the saints under the altars, arose from the anxiety of the primitive Christians to erect their churches and altars upon those places where the saints and martyrs were buried, or where they commemorated their death. This gives no sanction whatever to the present corrupt and anti-scriptural practice and doctrine of the Church of Rome, respecting relics. Bona, the learned Roman Catholic writer, says upon this subject, Liber 1, c. 19, 5; "Cepit hic primum in Ecclesia Romana observari et ab ea ad alias dimanavit." "This practice began first to be observed in the Roman Catholic Church, and flowed from her to other churches." Thus your Church was the means of their corruption.

by the priest alone ; quite inconsistent with his calling upon you all in a loud voice "clara voce" to pray "oremus." The prayer is excellent, but why does he repeat it only to himself ? Perhaps he wishes to prevent its inconsistency with the following prayer, which he repeats aloud, being remarked by the hearers. This latter prayer puts forward two doctrines, both opposed to God's word ; the merits of the saints, and the spiritual virtues attached to their reliques, each of which doctrines we shall consider. It is unnecessary to bring forward the passages from God's word, which proclaim in the plainest language, "that man possesses no merit in the sight of God." Our blessed Lord himself, than whom we cannot have higher authority, says, Luke xvii. 10, "So you also, when you have done all the things that are commanded you, say, 'we are unprofitable servants, we have done that we ought to do.' " And he says this, remember, to his chosen apostles, taking away even from *them* all merit. In Isaiah lxiv. 4, we read—"but *we all* are as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are but as filthy rags." Such is the language of God's saints. Again, Romans iii. 10, Douay version ; "There is not any man just." Numerous passages could be quoted to the same effect. Why do you not regard what God himself tells you in his blessed word ? You admit that God's grace must give you the inclination to obey his will, and to do what you call good works ; therefore, if there be any merit, it *belongs to him* who supplies you with the means.

If I send money to a person by my servant, surely the merit, so to speak, of the charity, belongs not to the servant, but to me. You seem to forget that St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20—" You are not your own, for you are bought with a great price ;" every thing we possess we received from God, and are accountable to him, the giver, for its use.

Again, are not the merits of Christ sufficient to atone for your sins ? This you admit, for in all the most ancient prayers of your Mass, supplication is made only through him. We are justified in the sight of God by

his merits and sufferings, through our looking with faith to Jesus as God's appointed means, by which *only* a sinner can be reconciled to his offended God; and therefore must renounce every merit of our own, as you profess to do, in part of your confiteor, where you smite your breast and say you have, all without exception, "offended by your fault, your very great fault." Surely no person born of woman, with the exception of our Lord Jesus Christ, but must with truth join in this acknowledgment—"Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, for in thy sight no man living can be justified." Ps. cxlii. 2. Why do you then attribute merit in the sight of God to the saints, which *they* utterly renounce? No man living can be justified in the sight of God by his own merits. For no man is without sin, and sin deserves God's judgments. Where, then, are those human merits upon which he may depend for justification?

Again we ask, if the saints themselves disclaim all merit in the sight of God, what benefit can arise from having their bones under the altar? You justify this practice by referring to three passages in the Bible:—2 Kings xiii. 21, where it is recorded that the bones of Elisha when touched by a dead man restored him to life. 2. Your Church refers to the woman touching the hem or border of our Lord's garment, and being made whole. Matt. ix. 20. And 3, to Acts xi. 11, 12; where handkerchiefs or aprons were brought to touch the body of Paul, and miraculously cured those who were touched by them. These references to support the use of relics in your Church I find in the table of controversies at the end of your Douay Testament, and I ask what countenance do they give to your present practice? These passages refer to *bodily cures*, to certain miracles performed upon the bodies of different individuals; if you wish to imitate what these passages relate, take the bones and your other holy reliques from beneath the altars, and let the sick and diseased touch them, and if they find themselves restored to health, we will admit that you have an invaluable possession.

But, until they are exhibited in this way, and for this purpose, you have no right whatsoever to claim the authority of God's word for a practice totally opposed both to the spirit and letter of Scripture. How do you ascertain that the bones you possess are the bones of a saint? Various churches of your creed lay claim to the possession of the *same person's head*. Several say they possess a leg or an arm of a particular saint; and if their assertions be true, that saint must have had more than the usual number of legs and arms.

When St. Stephen was stoned to death the disciples did not place his body under the altar, and adore his bones; we are told they buried him. Acts viii. 2. Hezekiah broke in pieces the brazen serpent made by Moses at the appointment of God, when the people burnt incense before it. 2 Kings xviii. 4. Are not the merits of the saints, even supposing them, contrary to God's word, to possess merit in the sight of God, sufficiently efficacious, unless their bones are raked up from the charnel-house or grave; and instead of being permitted to return to dust, are exhibited as a public spectacle and show, for the purpose of deceiving you as to their miraculous properties, and of thus increasing your veneration for your Church, as being privileged by God to possess such invaluable powers. This prayer is one of the many innovations in your Mass; nor can its existence be shown before the eighth century. If the early Christians obtained mercy through Jesus only,—as must have been the case, because the individuals to whom these bones and reliques belonged, had not then died,—surely you may well be satisfied with what sufficed them. This is one of the many instances, notwithstanding your boasted antiquity, of your Church encouraging you to wander after those vain and empty delusions which are entirely opposed to the ancient doctrine. Not a sentence do we read in the annals of the Primitive Church, about this fondness for reliques as means of grace. Surely at that early period it would have been an easy matter for the early Christians to have supplied themselves with pieces of the true cross,

the nails which fastened our Lord to it, and portions of his garment. They might have obtained various articles belonging to the Blessed Virgin, and the other saints; all of which were genuine. Such would certainly have been the case, if a spirit such as was afterwards exhibited in the Roman Church, then prevailed; and how easily could they then have distinguished the true from the counterfeit!

I would here enumerate some of the present relics asserted to be preserved in various of your churches, including some of even the Milk of the Blessed Virgin, were I not apprehensive that you would suppose I was only mocking, and wishing to turn your practices into ridicule; but I am more disposed to grieve over, and deplore the lamentable departure of your Church, in this respect, from scriptural truth and common sense.

R.—In missa solemni celebrans antequam legat introitum benedicit incensum dicens, ab illo bene ✠ dicaris in cuius honore cremaberis—Amen. Et accepto thuribulo a Diacono incensat altare nihil dicens Postea Diaconus recepto thuribulo a celebrante incensit illum tantum. Deinde celebrans signans se signo crucis incipit Introitum quo finito junctis manibus alternatim cum ministris dicit.

T.—In solemn or high Masses, the officiating priest, before he reads the Introite, (consisting of short portions of Scripture, different upon different days,) blesses the incense, saying, “ May you be blessed (signing it with the sign of the cross) by him in whose honor you will be burnt. Amen.” Then taking the thurible, or vessel which contains the incense, from the deacon, he incenses the altar in silence. Afterwards the deacon taking the incense vessel from the officiating priest, and signing himself with the sign of the cross, begins to repeat the Introite, which being ended, he repeats alternately with the ministers or clerks—

R.—Kyrie eleison, Kvrie eleison, Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Christe eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison.

T.—Lord have mercy upon me, 3 times ; Christ have mercy upon me, 3 times ; Lord have mercy upon me.

Here again we have to remark upon some additional novelties of your church—the use of “incense,” and the blessing it, and signing it with the sign of the cross. Incense was appointed by God to be burnt upon the altar in the Jewish Church, Exod. xxx. 1. It was emblematical of the prayers and thanksgiving offered up before the throne of grace, Ps. cxli. 2. We find this custom also continued by Zachariah, one of the Jewish priests, and father to John the Baptist, Luke i. 9. And in the Book of Revelation the same idea is preserved, where we are told that the four-and-twenty ancients and the four living creatures have golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints.\*

The law of Moses was, as the apostle Paul says in the Hebrews, x. 1, “only the shadow of things to come ;” and therefore when that which was prefigured by the law—viz. the coming of the Saviour—was accomplished, all those rites and ceremonies were no longer necessary. Why was not incense used by our blessed Lord at the celebration of his last supper ? Why did not the holy apostles mention it in their epistles ? Where are you told by God in his word that there is any blessing attached to it ? Its introduction is modern ; in the Primitive Church we seek for it in vain. And again we inquire why is it signed with the sign of the cross ? Where is your authority for supposing that

\* Note on this verse in the Douay Testament, verse 8 : “Here we see that the saints in heaven offer up to Christ the prayers of the faithful upon earth.” Now we ask does this appear from the text if you interpret it literally ; it was only the twenty-four ancients and the four living creatures whose province it was to do so, and therefore you see clearly that the saints whose intercession you solicit are not employed in that way at all. And by referring to Revelation viii. 3, 4, you will find it to be an angel to whom was given much incense, that he should offer up the prayers of *all the saints* ; and the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angel. Here we are expressly told that the prayers of *all the saints* are offered up by the angel. Whether our blessed Lord is here represented, is of little consequence, to confute the Romish doctrine. And thus the saints in heaven, to whom you pray, have nothing to say or do in the matter, and your prayers to them are thus useless.

inanimate things thus become more holy, by being marked with the sign of the cross? St. Paul tells you that "it is by the word of God and prayer that we are to sanctify any thing," 1 Tim. iv. 5; which does not imply that it is to be endued with any particular virtue, but only to be separated for divine purposes for the service of God. What is the meaning of incense being poured upon the altar, and upon the deacons, and upon the officiating priest? Even in the Jewish worship we find nothing of the kind; the incense was burnt, and not poured or cast upon the altar or priest—so that you have no authority in God's word for your practice. Your church must certainly entertain doubts of the efficacy of the preceding sprinklings with holy water, and the numerous previous crossings, when this new custom is introduced in addition, like the others, upon her own sole authority.

R.—Postea in medio altaris extendens et jungens manus caput que aliquantulum inclinans dicit si dicendum est "Gloria in excelsis Deo," et prosequitur junc-  
tis manibus; cum dicit, adoramus te, gratias agimus tibi, Jesu Christe, et suscipe deprecationem, inclinat caput; et in fine dicens "cum sancto spiritu," signat se a fronte ad pectus.

In some Masses this is omitted.

T.—Next, the priest extending and joining his hands over the middle of the altar, bowing his head a little, says (if it is to be said on that day) the prayer of "Glory to God in the highest," and continues it with his hands joined together. *When he says "We adore thee, we give thee thanks, O Lord Jesus Christ, and receive our prayer," or deprecation to avert the consequence of our sins, he bows his head, and at the conclusion saying "With the Holy Spirit," he makes the sign of the cross on his forehead and breast.*

We ask here what is the object of his crossing himself? What reason has he now for supposing he will be more favorably listened to on account of his doing

this? What evil spirits does he now think are about him, who are to be driven or frightened away with the sign of the cross?

#### GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO.

R.—Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra, pax hominibus bona voluntatis. Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam, Domine Deus, Rex celestis, Deus Pater Omnipotens, Domine Fili unigenite, Jesu Christe, Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. Qui tollis peccat mundi suscipe deprecationem nostram, qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis quoniam tu solus sanctus tu solus Dominus tu solus altissimus Jesu Christe cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria Dei patris. Amen.

T.—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we adore thee, we glorify thee. We give thee thanks on account of thy great glory, Lord God, Heavenly King, God the Father Almighty. O Lord, the only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou who takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of the Father, have mercy upon us. Since thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord. Thou art the highest, O Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

This is a very ancient prayer, and in strict conformity with the word of God. Here we are taught to address the several persons of the Eternal Trinity, immediately; knowing they have been made favorable to us through the blood of Jesus. And why cannot you act always upon this principle? And do you not perceive that you require not the merits and intercession of the saints, when the merits and intercession of the Lord Jesus Christ are sufficient, and more than sufficient, to reconcile a sinner to God. Here, also, remember you

address Jesus, who, you say, *sitteth*, mark, at the present time, at the right hand of God.

R.—Sic dicitur “ gloria in excelsis” etiam in missis beatæ Mariæ quando dicenda est.

T.—Thus is repeated “ the Glory in the highest,” even when it is to be said in the Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

We could make many remarks upon this title, “ of the Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” and upon the titles of many other of your Masses; and upon the strangeness of calling the supper of the Lord after any other name than his own. We could also bring forward many prayers, from your own authorized forms, to show that you are not satisfied with only seeking the intercession of the saints, but that you address them directly, as if they possessed *in themselves* the power of granting your petitions. But doing so, at present, would lead us from the chief object we have in view.

R.—Deinde osculatur altare in medio, et versus ad populum dicit “ Dominus vobiscum,” R. “ et cum spiritu tuo,” postea dicit “ Oremus” et orationes, unam aut plures, ut ordo officii postulat: sequitur Epistola, Graduale, Tractus, vel Alleluia cum versu, aut sequentia, ut postulat tempus. His finitis, si est missa solemnis, Diaconus deponit Librum Evangeliorum super medium altaris, et celebrans benedicit incensum ut supra, deinde Diaconus genuflexus ante altare manibus junctis dicit.

T.—*Then the priest kisses the altar in the middle, and turning to the people, says;* “ The Lord be with you,” (how absurd to address them in Latin of which they cannot understand one word !) and they answer by the clerk, as they know not what is said—“ And with thy spirit,” meaning the priest’s spirit. After this he says “ Let us pray,” and prayers one or more, as the order of the particular daily office requires, are said. The Epistle follows, then the Gradual, the Tract or Alleluia, with a verse or “ sequentia,” as the time requires. All these are titles given to several prayers, and verses or passages from Holy Scripture, but which

vary upon the different Sundays and festivals. Some of the prayers are very good, others highly objectionable, as speaking of our obtaining blessings from God through the merits and intercession of particular saints. Having finished, if it be a Solemn or High Mass, the deacon lays down the book of the Gospels upon the middle of the altar, and the officiating priest blesses the incense as before-mentioned; that is, he does it a second time, as if he were conscious the first were insufficient or of no value. Then the deacon kneeling before the altar with his hands joined, says—

R.—*Munda cor meum ac labia mea, Omnipotens Deus, qui labia Isaiae prophetæ calculo mundasti ignito; ita mea tuà gratà miseratione dignare mundare, ut sanctum Evangelium tuum, digne valeam nuntiare, per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.*

T.—Cleanse my heart and lips, O omnipotent God, who cleansed the lips of the prophet Isaiah with a burning coal. So vouchsafe to cleanse me, by thy gracious compassion, that I may be enabled worthily to proclaim thy blessed Gospel; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

R.—*Postea accipit librum de altare et rursus genuflexus benedictionem petit sacerdote, dicens, "Jube Domine, benedicere."*

T.—After this, he, the deacon, takes up the book from the altar, and again kneeling down beseeches a blessing from the priest, saying, “O Lord, command him to bless me.”

R.—*Sacerdos respondet.*

T.—The priest replies—

R.—*Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis, ut digne et competenter annunties Evangelium suum. In nomine Patris et Filii  et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.*

T.—May the Lord be in your heart, and in your lips, that you may worthily, and competently, proclaim his Gospel, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, (he crosses himself here, we know not why,) and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

R.—Et accepta benedictione, osculatur manum Celebrantis et cum aliis ministris, incenso et luminaribus, accedens ad locum Evangelii, stans junctis manibus dicit.—“ Dominus vobiscum.” Res. Et cum spiritu tuo. Et prenuntians sequentia sancti Evangelii secundum.—N, sive initium, pollicé destræ manus, signat librum in principio Evangelii, quod est lecturus, deinde seipsum in fronte, ore et pectore ; et tum ministri respondent “ Gloria tibi Domine :” incensat ter librum, postea prosequitur Evangelium junctis manibus. Quo finito subdiaconus defert librum sacerdoti, qui osculatur Evangelium dicens. “ Per Evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta.

T.—The deacon having received the celebrating priest's blessing, kisses his hand, and approaching with the other attendants or clerks, with the incense, and lights, to the place where the Gospel is, and standing with joined hands, says, “ The Lord be with you.” Answer—“ And with thy spirit ;” and pronouncing the Sequentia, or following, of the Holy Gospel according to “ N,” that is, any of the four Gospels. Or he says “ The beginning,” he signs the sign of the Cross with the thumb of his right hand in the beginning of the Gospel he is about to read. And he then crosses himself from the forehead, mouth, and breast ; and while the attendants reply “ Glory be to thee, O Lord,” he incenses the book three times, and afterwards reads the Gospel, his hands being joined ; which being ended, the sub-deacon takes the book to the priest, who kisses the Gospel, saying, “ May our sins be forgiven through the words contained in the Gospel.”

We ask, what is the advantage to be derived from all this crossing, and from the book of the Gospel being incensed no less than three times, or from one priest kissing the hand of another priest ? Does the book of the blessed Gospel, or the priests, become more holy by these absurd unmeaning forms ? We see nothing of this in the Word of God ; every thing there is plain and simple. We can discover no traces of any such practices in the Primitive Church. All this “ *will worship* ”

was introduced in comparatively modern times into the service of the Church of Rome. We also remark a new practice mentioned in the above passage, namely, the use of lighted candles during the celebration of the Mass. Where is the authority for such a custom? Wherein consists the advantage of having lighted candles on your altars? They are only calculated, with your other forms, to withdraw the attention of those who witness what is going forward, from spiritual subjects, and to fix it upon useless external forms. Lights were originally used in times of persecution, when the early Christians were compelled to celebrate divine service in caves, vaults, and cellars.

R.—*Deinde sacerdos incensatur a diacono. Si vero sacerdos sine diacono et sub-diacono celebret, delato libro ad aliud cornu altaris, inclinatus in medio, junctis manibus dicit. "Munda cor meum," ut supra, et jube Domine, benedicere, Dominus sit in corde mea et in labiis meis, ut digne et competenter annuntiem Evangelium suum. Amen.*

T.—Then the priest is incensed by the deacon; but if the priest celebrates Mass without the deacon and sub-deacon taking the book to the corner of the altar and bowing towards the middle of it, with joined hands he says, "Cleanse my heart," as above, and "Command him, O Lord, to bless me. May the Lord be in my heart, and in my lips, that I may worthily and competently declare his Gospel. Amen."

What is the advantage of this repeated "incensing?" Nothing like this is to be found in God's word. Surely it cannot make the priest more holy, or more fit to celebrate the sacred mysteries. The prayer he offers up to God, to enable him worthily to proclaim his Gospel, is excellent; but not satisfied with this, he acts as if he supposed God could not grant his petition, unless he was also covered with incense.

R.—*Deinde conversus ad librum junctis manibus dicit. Dominus vobiscum. R.—Et cum spiritu tuo, et pronuntians initium sive sequentia sancti evangelii,*

*signat librum et se in fronte, ore, et pectore, et legit evangelium ut dictum est. Quo finito respondet minister. Laus tibi, Christe, et sacerdos osculatur evangelium dicens. Per evangelica dicta ut supra. In missis defunctorum dicitur. Munda cor meum sed non petitur benedictio, non deferuntur luminaria nec celebrans osculatur librum. Deinde ad medium altaris, extendens, elevans, et jungens manus dicit si dicendum est. Credo in unum Deum et prosequitur junctis manibus. Cum dicit "Deum," caput cruci inclinat. Quod similiter facit cum dicit Jesum Christum et simul adoratur. Ad illa autem verba. "Et incarnatus est," genuflectit usque dum dicatur. "Et homo factus est." In fine ad, "et vitam venturi sæculi" signat se signo crucis a fronte ad pectus.*

T.—Then having turned to the book, and his hands being joined, he says, "The Lord be with you." R.— "And with thy spirit." And pronouncing "the beginning" or the "sequentia of the blessed Gospel," he makes the sign of the Cross upon the book, and on his forehead, mouth, and breast, and reads the Gospel, as was said before; which being ended, the minister says "Praise be to thee, O Christ;" and the priest kisses the Gospel, saying, "May our sins be blotted out by the words of the Gospel," as was said before. In Masses for the dead, the prayer of "Cleanse my heart, &c." is said; but the "benediction" is not sought for, nor are the lights brought over, nor does the officiating priest kiss the book. Then, at the middle of the altar, extending, raising, and joining his hands together, he says, if it is to be said, "I believe in one God," (the Nicene Creed,) and goes through it with joined hands. When he pronounces the word "God," he bows his head to the Cross. He does the same when he pronounces the words "Jesus Christ," and adores at the same time. But at the words "He became incarnate," he kneels until he repeats the words "And was made Man." At the conclusion, when he repeats the words "life everlasting," he signs himself with the sign of the Cross both on his forehead and breast.

Here we find more useless forms, more crossings, and kissings of the book of the Gospel, and bowings. Where is the authority for all these senseless exhibitions? But in the Masses for the dead, some of these forms are omitted; I take for granted, if they were supposed to be of any value, they would be retained, but, in truth, they can be easily dispensed with, as it would be difficult to prove their value. See what various attitudes are used in repeating the Nicene Creed; the early fathers, when this Creed was composed at the Council of Nice, in the year 325, little contemplated these unmeaning forms, introduced in after ages, during its repetition.

#### NICENE CREED.

Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, visibilium omnium et invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum, Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula. Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum non factum; consubstantiale Patri. Per quem omnia facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem, descendit de cœlis, (*hic genuflectitur*) et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Maria Virgine; et homo factus est. Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die, secundum scripturas. Et ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dextram Patris; et iterum venturus est cum gloria, judicare vivos et mortuos: ejus regni non erit finis.

Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit. Qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per prophetas. Et unam Catholicam, et apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen.

T.—I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things, visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only be-

gotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very (or true) God from very (or true) God ; begotten, not made ; being of one substance with the Father ; by whom (the Son) all things were made. Who, for us men, and our salvation, came down from heaven, (here the priest bows or kneels,) and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us, under Pontius Pilate ; he suffered, and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty : from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son : who with the Father and the Son, is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life everlasting. Amen.

Such is the Creed called "the Nicene Creed," compiled by the bishops and fathers of the Christian Catholic or Universal Church at the Council of Nice, held, as before stated, in the year 325. There is much matter contained in this Creed ; it declares the essential articles of faith believed at the period when the Council was held. It sets forth, clearly and plainly, the doctrine of the Trinity, or, that the God-head consists of three divine Persons, equal and co-eternal—that the second Person, the Lord Jesus Christ, "for us men, and for our salvation," took upon him the nature of man, save only as to sin, and was born of the Virgin Mary—was crucified by command of Pontius Pilate, was buried, and rose again the third day—and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God to make intercession for us, sinners, with his Father, as was before stated, and that He will come from thence to judge the quick (those who will be alive at the last day) and the dead. We also acknowledge our belief in the distinct personality and divinity of the Holy

Ghost, the Lord and Giver of spiritual life. We also state our belief that he spake to us by the prophets, and writers of the Holy Scriptures, as St. Peter tells us that "holy men of God spake inspired by the Holy Ghost," 2 Peter i. 21, Douay version. Also our belief in the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Catholic, means universal; and we believe that our blessed Lord wished to establish a church all over the world—the doctrines and precepts of which should be equally binding upon all; and this conclusion follows from the object which our Lord had in view, namely: to die for the whole world. As St. Peter says, Acts x. 35, "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh justice, is acceptable to him."

Thus we learn that Christ has one universal church, which, in God's appointed time, will extend all over the world. And, in order to guide us in ascertaining whether we belong to this Church, we are taught to believe and to admit that it must be "Apostolical," that is, governed by the same doctrines and articles of faith which the Apostles taught. To this view agrees what our Lord said, immediately before he ascended into heaven, to his Apostles, Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20—"And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Thus you see, *that following the doctrines of the Apostles*, is essential to constitute a member of the Catholic Church. Your calling yourselves by such a title, is not sufficient, but you must examine your doctrines as set forth in the Mass, the principal part of your religious worship, and see what countenance they receive from the writings of the Apostles. Again, you learn from this passage, that no change of faith was to be permitted; what Jesus had commanded, they were to continue to teach to the end of the world.

But, you will ask, is it not impossible for the Church of Christ to err, when Jesus has declared “ he will be always with it !” This leads us to the *foundation of your system*, and to inquire, in the first place, into the reasons for your belief, that the Roman Catholic Church, with the Bishop of Rome, or the Pope, at its head, is the Church of Christ ; and, consequently, free from essential error. Your belief as Roman Catholics is, that our Lord committed his Church to the government of St. Peter, and as the Bishops of Rome claim to be the successors of St. Peter, that this charge continues to them ; and thus the Church of Christ is identified by you with the Roman Catholic Church. That, as a consequence of that privilege, all those who separate from her, and do not submit to her authority, peril their eternal salvation.

Your Church claims power over all others, as being under the charge of the Pope, St. Peter’s successor. Where in the Word of God, do you find that the Church was placed under the government of St. Peter ? Let us lay bare the foundation of this claim, and refer to Milner’s “ End of Religious Controversy,” where we shall find the arguments in support of it put forward in the strongest and most forcible manner of which they are capable. “ The strongest proof,” as the learned Doctor states, “ of St. Peter’s dignity and jurisdiction consists in that explicit and energetical declaration of our Saviour to him, in the quarters of Cæsarea Philippi, upon his making that glorious confession of our Lord’s divinity, ‘ Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,’ ” Matt. xvi. 16. Now take up your Douay Testaments, and open them at that chapter, and judge yourselves, whether this “ strongest proof” of Milner’s is sufficient to bear up the vast superstructure erected upon it. You will find at the 13th v., how our Lord began to question his disciples : “ Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am ?” After hearing the various opinions of the people, some of whom said he was John the Baptist, and some Elias, and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets ; Jesus said unto them, “ But

whom say you that I am?" Peter answered, and said, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answering, said to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, son of Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee, that thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

"I will build my Church upon *this rock*," said the Saviour. Not surely upon St. Peter; whom our Lord, in a few verses after this, calls "Satan." Not surely upon St. Peter; who denied, with oaths and imprecations, that he had any knowledge of our Lord, and thus for a time was separated from his Master's cause, Mark xiv. 71. Not surely upon Peter; whom St. Paul withheld from the face, Gal. ii. 11, because he was to be blamed; and countenanced erroneous doctrines; but upon his *confession*, that Jesus was the Christ, the anointed, the Son of the living God. The privilege of binding and loosing was not confined exclusively to St. Peter; for we find our Lord extending it to all his disciples, only two chapters after, Matt. xviii. 13, and thus making them *equal to Peter*, who thus lost his superiority, even supposing he ever possessed it. But as a reward for his being the first to confess that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, the keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed, in one sense, to him; and he had the privilege conferred upon him of being the first to preach the Gospel to the Jews, which he did upon the day of Pentecost, Acts ii.; and to the Gentiles, when Cornelius the Centurion was converted, Acts x. 24; and thus the Gospel, which signifies "the kingdom of heaven," was unlocked to both Jews and Gentiles by Peter.

Now, the very nature of this privilege shows it was not to descend upon those who claim to be his succes-

sors—namely, the Bishops of Rome. The privilege was his being the *first* to preach or unlock the Gospel to both Jews and Gentiles, and, therefore, when that was accomplished it could not be repeated by a successor.

But, perhaps, you may inquire—Did not our Lord commit the lambs and sheep of his fold three several times to Peter, and did he not then, as mentioned by St. John xxi. 17, confer on him the supremacy over his entire Church, both clergy and laity, represented by the sheep and the lambs? We say, open your Douay Testaments at the above-mentioned chapter, and let the text speak for itself. We must remind you that this conversation occurred after the resurrection of our blessed Lord. Upon a former occasion, as is recorded by St. Matthew xxvi. 33, Peter had declared, “Though all men should be scandalized in thee, I will never be scandalized”—that is, as explained by the note in the Douay Testament, “shall never be scandalized by his running from, and forsaking his Master,” when he was apprehended by the chief priests and scribes; and we know in what a melancholy way Peter broke that promise and denied his Master. It was, therefore, considered necessary by our blessed Lord, to restore Peter again to his apostleship, from which he had apostatized; and, as Peter had denied our Lord three times, so, in this passage, he is three several times restored to his ministry.

We find this view of the subject fully borne out by the message given to the women, Mark xvi. 7, by the angel—“Go and tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee.” Here Peter\* is not called a *disciple*—he is specially named *after* the disciples, as if to mark how he had forfeited all claim to that office, not merely by forsaking our Lord, for that they all did at first, and St. John is the only one who returned and remained with his Master to the last, but on account of his denial. Our Lord, therefore, in the

\* The surname “Peter” is still given him, to prevent his utter despair of being forgiven.

exercise of his infinite mercy, sent specially for Peter to restore him to his office of feeding his flock, in common with the other apostles. "When they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter—Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?" John xxi. 15. In thus addressing him he wished to remind him of the vain presumptuous manner in which, in the above-mentioned instance, Matt. xxvi. 33, he had boasted of his own attachment and fidelity, at the expense of the other disciples. He does not now call him "*Peter*," signifying *the stone*, of which title his unsteady conduct proved him to be utterly unworthy, but his own proper name, "Simon, son of John or Jonas." Peter, having been since taught a bitter lesson respecting the folly and sinfulness of self-confidence, answers with humility, no longer making comparisons between himself and the other disciples, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." He saith to him, "Feed my lambs." He saith to him again, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" Peter again replies, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." He saith to him, "Feed my lambs." He saith to him the third time, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" Peter was grieved, because he said to him the third time, "lovest thou me;" and he said to him, "Lord, thou knowest all things—thou knowest that I love thee." He said to him, "Feed my sheep."

If any exclusive honor or privilege were conferred here upon Peter, must not Peter have been aware of it, as having heard the words of our Lord addressed to him personally? and, certainly, the other apostles had also, we may reasonably suppose, better opportunities of understanding our Lord's meaning than the comparatively modern aspirants to, and supporters of, the supremacy of the Roman Church. Why was he *grieved* when our Lord proposed the question to him the third time, instead of being elated with joy at this universal authority being conferred upon him? He was grieved for either one of two reasons, or, perhaps, he was influenced by both—particularly by the latter: either he felt that our Lord doubted his sincerity, notwithstanding

his profession of love to him ; or that, when the question was proposed to him the third time, he *then*, and not until *then*, understood that it had reference to his having denied our Lord three times ; and, although he wept bitterly, as the Evangelist tells us, when “the Lord turned and looked upon him,” still this was more a feeling of sorrow and regret at losing so kind a master, and of his ingratitude towards him. But Jesus now speaks to him in a different character. He has now risen from the dead, and Peter’s feeling of humiliation and self-condemnation must have been, if possible, increased, when he knew the real character of that Jesus whom he had renounced by denial.

Why, if this be not the true sense of the passage, should Peter have been questioned three times, and the last time have felt grieved ? But only three verses farther on we find a passage, which proves beyond the possibility of doubt, that Peter was to exercise no authority over the other Apostles. When Peter asked a question concerning St. John, the beloved Apostle, and said, “Lord, and what shall this man do ?” Jesus saith to him, “If I will have him to remain till I come, what is it to thee ? follow thou me :” thus openly rebuking him for presuming to interfere with John in the exercise of that commission which all the Apostles received only *from the Saviour himself*, and which they held, each independently of any other authority but that of their Divine Master. Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

I will now bring before you a few of those passages from the Holy Scriptures, which show clearly, how your Church is misleading you upon this matter. In Matthew xviii. 1, and coming immediately after that conversation held with Peter in chap. xvi., we are told, “At that hour the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Who, thinkest thou, is greatest in the kingdom of heaven ?” Why did not the disciples, who were present at the former conversation with Peter, chap. xvi., understand it as giving the supremacy to Peter, and then there would be no necessity for proposing this question to our Lord ; or, if they could possibly have been so

dull of comprehension, as to have misunderstood our Lord, why did not he set them right at once, and repeat what he had said before? We find in his answer he makes no allusion whatever to Peter, but takes a little child, and sets him in the midst of them, and says, "Unless ye be converted, and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." We are to suppose that Peter also accompanied the other disciples to ask this question; consequently, if he had mistaken the nature of his privilege, that mistake would now be corrected. Again, in the 18th verse of the same chapter, we find all the Apostles equally endued with the power of binding and loosing—granted the same privilege which Peter had received before, and thus made equal to him. That is, that whatever doctrines and precepts they, through the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, should commit to writing, should bind the whole Church, and should be ratified and confirmed in heaven, as being suggested and taught by God himself, John xiv. 26. Not a word here about St. Peter's sanction being necessary.

Our Lord also mentions, Matt. xix. 23, that the twelve Apostles will sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Here all are mentioned as being upon equal terms.

We find, John xx. 21, &c., a most direct proof that the Apostles obtained their commission, and were to exercise it independently of each other, and consequently, of Peter. After our Lord's resurrection, we hear him addressing them, and saying, "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you; and when he had said this, he breathed on them, and he said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Here we find them individually receiving equal power, equal authority, to make laws under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, then breathed upon them, to bind the Church. And, as we before stated, having committed those precepts and doctrines to writing, when they had departed to their eternal rest,

men would have the means of ascertaining, by reading what they had taught, the gospel plan of salvation.

That the Pope, or Church of Rome, possesses this power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and retaining offences or sins, is absurd in the extreme. As, in the first place, St. Peter enjoyed no such exclusive privilege, as we see in the Council of Jerusalem, and by St. Paul resisting him to the face, and also because the enjoyment of such a power by any body of men succeeding the Apostles, would naturally produce the greatest confusion and uncertainty in matters of faith ; as *we could never be certain that what the Apostles had set forth in the Scriptures had not been repealed by your Church.* And this will account for the reluctance which your Church, which claims such authority, naturally entertains against the reading of the Scriptures. As many things are practised and sanctioned by her which are entirely at variance with what we read there ; your Church, in the plenitude of her usurped power, having presumed to repeal and change many express ordinances of God himself ; consequently, with these views of your Church's authority, the Holy Scriptures must be most dangerous, as calculated to unsettle and disturb the minds of her members.

Again, Matt. xx. 21, the mother of Zebedee's children, with her sons, Mark x. 35, James and John, besought our Lord, that her two sons may sit, one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom. Surely they could never have supposed that the primacy or chieftainship was given to Peter, or such a petition would never have been offered ; and in the answer given by our Lord, not an allusion is made to any such grant having been made, or that their request was an interference with Peter's alleged supremacy. We read, verse 24, "When the ten heard it they were filled with indignation against the two brethren." Was this feeling produced among them on account of Peter's privileges, who was one of the ten, being encroached upon, *and who himself makes no special complaint in consequence?* By no means, but at the notion that any

of the Apostles wished to set themselves above the others. The answer of our Lord tears up the whole of the boasted supremacy of Peter from its very foundation. Jesus called them to him, and said, " You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. *It shall not be so among you;* but whosoever wishes to be greater among you let him be your minister, (or servant;) and he that will be, (or wishes to be,) first among you shall be your servant." All the Apostles were thus encouraged to contend for no primacy, but one of humility. Does this give any countenance to Peter's supremacy, or his having any authority over the other Apostles? Surely not.

In Matthew xxiii. 8, we read how Jesus said—" Be not you called Rabbi, for one is your master, and *all you are brethren;* and call none your father upon earth, for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters, *for one is your master,* Christ." How does this agree with the doctrine of one apostle being superior to the others? We also find, after the ascension of our blessed Lord, that the apostles acted upon this principle of equality, and that it was the resolution or decree of the body, which was to govern the others. Thus, in Acts viii. 14, we read—" Now, when the apostles which were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them, Peter and John." Would the other apostles presume to have done this, if Peter were considered their superior; and we find St. John and he, spoken of here in the same terms. Our blessed Lord mentions this very act, as a proof of the inferiority in that respect of the person sent, John xiii. 16—" Amen, Amen, I say to you, the servant is not greater than his lord; neither is *the apostle* (or person sent) *greater than he that sent him.*" Thus Peter and John, who were sent by the other apostles to preach the gospel in Samaria, could not be considered, as our Lord expresses it, greater than those other apostles who were at Jerusalem, and who sent them on their mission. We never hear

of the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, being sent by the Cardinals or his fellow-bishops upon such a mission. And why? Because he claims an authority and power never enjoyed or thought of by Peter or the other apostles.

In Acts xv. we read of a council being held at Jerusalem. If Peter were considered chief of the apostles, surely he would have presided; but we find he did not. It was after there had been much disputing that Peter delivered his opinion, v. 7, which, we learn, was not final; for after that, Paul and Barnabas spoke; and lastly, St. James, who, it appears, presided at the council, delivers his judgment, and sums up all the preceding arguments, v. 19. As the result of this judgment, we read, v. 22, how "it pleased the apostles and ancients, with the whole church, to choose men," &c. And again, hear the wording of the decree sent forth to the brethren of the Gentiles, v. 23—"The apostles and ancients, brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles," &c. In the entire of this decree there is no mention whatever made of Peter, which omission surely could not have occurred, were he the chief of the apostolic college. In every decree of the Roman Catholic Church, for the last several hundred years from the time of his usurpation, the name of the Bishop or Pope of Rome appears in a very prominent place, as if no decree could go forth without his sanction.

There is another important consideration suggested by this apostolic council. Jerusalem was, unquestionably, the mother church, where the Gospel was first preached on the day of Pentecost, and this church was presided over, as we see, by St. James, the bishop. We ask, as the Roman Church did not exist at that time, over what particular church did St. Peter preside? You may answer, over the entire Christian world. Admitted, for argument sake. Upon what authority, then, does the Bishop of *Rome* claim to be the only bishop entitled to that supremacy? Did Peter preside over the bishop of Jerusalem, his brother apostle; and if he did, was it not in the capacity of univer-

sal bishop? It would appear from this reasoning, that the Bishop of Rome has no title to be universal bishop or successor to St. Peter—such a title involves a contradiction of terms—and that the church of Christ would exist, even though there were no Bishop of Rome—or even though he were a heretic—or even though there were two or three claimants for the Papedom, all of which cases have occurred. There was no successor to Peter, in the Roman Catholic sense, and upon reference to the first chapter of his second Epistle, we shall find St. Peter speaking in the plainest terms of his death—being assured, as he says, v. 14, “that the laying away of this my tabernacle is at hand, according as our Lord Jesus Christ also hath signified to me.” Why should he not here speak of his successor? This would have been the proper time, if he were to have any. Why would he not here tell those whom he was addressing, that they were to appoint some person in his room, to whose advice they were to refer, and to whose authority they were to submit? He alludes to nothing of the kind; he refers to the Holy Scriptures, whereunto, he tells them, *they would do well to attend*, v. 19, for prophecy came not by the will of man at any time, but holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Many other arguments can be brought forward upon the subject. I shall only mention two in addition, which show the utter inconsistency of the doctrine. St. John, we know, survived St. Peter. Was St. Peter's *alleged successor*, or Bishop of Rome, Linus or Cletus—for, strange to say, even upon this successorship, Roman Catholic authors are not agreed—superior in authority to St. John? The supposition is absurd. And again, was Peter superior in authority to the blessed Virgin Mary? Was she one of the sheep or lambs who were given up to his charge, when, on the contrary, we read she was given in charge to John, the beloved apostle?

One favorite argument used by your church, and upon which you lay great stress, is derived from the fol-

lowing passage—"And the Lord said, 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.' " Luke xxii. 31, 32. Satan, said our Lord, has desired to have *you*, (all my disciples,) but I have prayed specially for thee, Simon, that thy faith *fail not utterly*, as the word in the original signifies, which our Lord knew would certainly happen when he denied him, but for his merciful interference. Do you, then, said our Lord, when you are converted, confirm or strengthen thy brethren. Show them in your own case, the mercy of God, and teach them the special wisdom and knowledge he possesses, by which your faults were foreshown. As to its being a proof of superiority, and confined to Peter alone, we can show that such is not the case ; for we read, Acts xiv. 22, how Paul and Barnabas "confirmed the souls of the disciples, and exhorted them to continue in the faith." Only a few verses farther, we read of the angel who was strengthening or confirming our Lord in his agony in the garden, v. 43 ; and surely the angel was not superior to our Lord. St. Peter speaks of the Prince of Pastors, but in doing so he specially alludes to our Lord, when he says, 1 Peter v. 4—"When the Prince of Pastors shall appear," &c., meaning the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Thus you see that the belief in the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is not necessarily connected with the belief in St. Peter's supremacy, which we have shown from Scripture to be utterly unfounded, and consequently has nothing to say to your Pope's pretended claim. The expression "Apostolic" in the Creed is most remarkable. It refers to *all* the Apostles as being the founders of the Catholic Church. St. Paul gives us this view very plainly, Ephes. ii. 19, &c. He is addressing the saints who are in Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus, i. 1. "You," he says, are "fellow-citizens with the saints and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus

Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building framed together groweth up into an holy temple unto the Lord." Here we find *all the Apostles* and Prophets are mentioned as being the foundation of the Church—not merely one. What, then, becomes of the assertion, that the Church is founded and built upon Peter alone?

The Roman Church assumes to be infallible : that is, that she cannot err. Because our blessed Lord has declared that the gates of hell shall never prevail against his Church, therefore the Roman Church claims to be infallible. The Church of Christ is two-fold—the visible and the invisible ; and one of the causes of your falling into error upon this matter arises from your not having both these distinctions clear before you: your teachers *wilfully* confound them. There is no promise of freedom from error given in Scripture to any visible, individual Church. Look to the Jewish Church, under the immediate control and government of God himself, and surely that Church was not free from error, as its history down to the crucifixion of our Lord to the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem fully shows. Look to the history of the early Christian Churches, recorded by faithful authors, and you can learn how every visible Church erred. Some have altogether ceased to exist. Look to your own proud and haughty Church of Rome, which claims infallibility. Look to her during the Arian heresy which prevailed in the fourth century, and principally against which the Council of Nice was held, whose Creed we have been considering. One of your Popes or Bishops of Rome, Liberius, was a heretic, and affixed his name to the Arian doctrine, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was only the highest of created beings, and not God. Many other instances I could give, but space would not permit.

Where does this infallibility exist ? In whom does it centre ? How is it to be called forth ? Not in councils ; for we have council contradicting council. Not in Popes ; for we have one Pope anathematizing or cursing another Pope. Not in both united ; for we

have them in direct opposition to each other. If such an infallibility, as your Church claims, did exist, surely there would be rules given whereby to discover it; but all these rules we search for in vain. The infallibility or truth of the invisible Church is a different matter altogether; that Church consists, to use the language of St. Peter, Acts x. 35, "of those in every nation who fear God and work justice." Our Lord himself, John xiv. 16, speaks of this Church, where he says, "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete or Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him, but you shall know him, because he shall abide with you and shall be in you." Here we see a plain distinction between the world, the external professors of the Gospel, and those who are led by the Spirit of God, who, as our Lord said, John xvi. 13, "will teach them all truth." "Many," as our Lord says, upon another occasion, Matt. xvi. 20, "are called, but few are chosen." Christ, as St. Paul tells us, Ephes. v. 25, 27, "loved the Church, and delivered himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish;" and this Church is formed by the influence and power of the Holy Ghost. "No man can say the Lord Jesus," or confess Jesus to be the Christ, as St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. xii. 3, "but by the Holy Ghost." "The kingdom of God," said our Lord, Luke xvii. 20, 21, "cometh not with observation; for lo, the kingdom of God is within you." And again, 1 John ii. 20, "you have an unction from the Holy One, (that is, grace and wisdom from the Holy Ghost,) and know all these things." All those things which were taught by our blessed Lord, and by his Apostles by his command, are set forth in those inspired writings, which Paul tells us, 2 Tim. iii. 15, "are able to instruct us to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Before we leave this subject of the Catholic and

Apostolic Church, I would make one further remark. The faith of the Church at Rome was spoken of, as St. Paul tells us, in, or throughout, the whole world, Romans i. 8; and he gives thanks to God through Jesus Christ for them all, on this very account: and yet we hear the Apostle saying, chap. xi. 21, "for if God hath not spared the natural branches, take care, lest perhaps he also spare not thee. See, then, the goodness and the severity of God, towards them indeed that are fallen the severity, but towards thee, the goodness of God, if thou abide in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off." Is it not, then, most remarkable, that the Roman Church is the only Church which received this caution from St. Paul, as if the Apostle, taught by the Spirit of God, had foreseen how that Church would apostatize from the pure faith, and introduce into her service and doctrines, as we have seen, various unscriptural novelties. This threat or warning of St. Paul can only refer to the Roman Church, considered as a particular visible Church, as it was utterly impossible for the invisible Church of Christ to fail.\* We find in this Epistle not even the name of Peter; though the faith of the Roman Church, as we before remarked, was spoken of throughout the world—and in the concluding chapter of this Epistle, though many celebrated Christians living at Rome are mentioned, yet Peter is not—a convincing proof that he could not have been exercising his episcopal functions there at that time.

Sufficient has been said to prove that the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, in which we profess our belief in the Nicene Creed, *cannot be the Church of Rome*; as she is neither Catholic, in the scriptural sense of the word, nor Apostolic, as following those doctrines set forth by the Apostles in their writings.

We may here remark upon an expression in the Apostles' Creed, upon which your Church affects to place great stress, as justifying your asking the interces-

\* Many visible Churches, however, *always* rejected the pretensions of the Church of Rome, and differed from her in doctrine. The Greek and other Eastern Churches, &c., for instance.

sion of the saints, namely, "the communion of saints." You can easily understand the meaning of this expression from what we have said concerning the invisible Church of Christ; and it comes immediately after the profession of the belief in the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Catholic Church. The meaning is, that all God's faithful servants are led and instructed by the same Spirit, in the one true faith in Jesus, "the way, the truth, and the life," and that they all drink of the same fountain of living waters. St. Paul, Eph. iv. 3, alludes to this, when he cautions the faithful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace—one body and one spirit—as you are called in one hope of your calling—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." St. John says, 1 John i. 7, "But if we walk in the light, as he also is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." See also John xvii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. x. 16-17. There are many other passages illustrating this subject; and thus we see it has nothing whatever to say on the invocation of saints.

#### RUBRIC AFTER THE NICENE CREED.

Deinde osculatur altare et versus ad populum dicit. S. Dominus vobiscum.—R. Et cum spiritu tuo. Postea dicit "Oremus," et offertarium. Quo dicto si est missa solemnis, Diaconus porrigit celebranti patenam cum hostia. Si privata sacerdos ipse accipit patenam cum hostia quam offerens dicit.

T.—Then he (the priest) kisses the altar, and turning to the people, says, "The Lord be with you." Response—"And with thy spirit." After this, he says, "Let us pray," and the Offertory, (which is a verse or verses of Scripture different upon different days.) Which, being repeated, if it be a solemn Mass, the deacon gives the paten with the host to the officiating priest. If it be a private Mass, the priest himself takes the paten with the host, which, offering up, he says—

R.—Suscipe, sancte Pater Omnipotens, æterne Deus,  
hanc immaculatam hostiam quam ego indignus famulus  
tuus offero tibi, Deo meo vivo et vero, pro innumerabili-  
bus peccatis et offenditibus, et negligentiis meis et  
pro omnibus circumstantibus, sed et pro omnibus fidelibus  
Christianis, vivis atque defunctis, ut mihi et illis  
proficiat ad salutem in vitam æternam. Amen.

T.—Receive, O holy Father Almighty, everlasting  
God, this unspotted host, which I, thine unworthy ser-  
vant, offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my  
innumerable faults and offences, and negligences, and  
for all here present, and also for all faithful Christians,  
both living and dead, that it may profit me and them for  
our salvation to eternal life. Amen.

This seems a strange prayer, even upon your own principles. The word "*host*," which is so familiar to you in the Mass, is the translation of "*hostia*," meaning a "*victim*" or "*sacrifice*." What is this your Church calls a host, and which the priest offers to God? Surely it is no more than mere flour and water, just as it comes from the hands of the baker. Remember, no change has as yet taken place, no transubstantiating prayer has yet been said; but it is nothing more nor less, even upon Roman Catholic grounds, than simple bread or wafer; and yet your priest, as instructed by your infallible Church, takes this up and offers it to God as a sacrifice for his sins, and for the sins of all present, and for those of all the faithful, both living and dead. How can you possibly justify such a prayer in such a place? Show any authority from the Apostles, that bread is to be considered as a sacrifice offered to God for our sins. No Church but your own, presuming upon her infallibility, would attempt such an outrage upon even common sense and consistency.

R.—Deinde faciens crucem cum eadem patena, deponit hostiam super corporale. Diaconus ministrat vi-  
num. Subdiaconus aquam in calice; vel si privata est  
missa utrumque infundit sacerdos, et aquam miscendam  
in calice benedicit  dicens.

T.—Then making the sign of the Cross with the same paten, he places the host upon the corporal ; the deacon pours the wine, the sub-deacon the water into the chalice. But if it be a private Mass, the priest pours in both, and blesses the water to be mixed in the chalice with the sign of the Cross, saying—

We perceive here, that water is mixed with the wine ; our blessed Lord, we read, did nothing of the sort—and St. Paul, in his description of the manner in which the Lord's supper was to be celebrated, and to which we referred before, 1 Cor. xi. 23, is silent as to any such practice. Consequently, the Reformed Church rejected the use of water in the Eucharist. We shall hereafter show how utterly inconsistent, mixing the water with the wine is with your other present tenets ;\* for if the early Christians believed the wine to be the *real* blood of our Lord, they never would have polluted it with mixture of water.

**ORATIO.**—Deus qui humanæ substantiæ dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti. Da nobis per hujus aquæ et vini mysterium, ejus divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps, Jesus Christus, Filius tuus, Dominus noster. Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

**PRAYER.**—O God, who hast wonderfully constituted the dignity of human nature, and more wonderfully reformed it, grant to us, through the mystery of this water and wine, to be partakers of his divinity, who condescended to be partaker of our humanity, even Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord, who liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God, world without end. Amen.

This prayer, we would remark, where you petition,

\* The practice was introduced at a very early period into the Church. The mixture of water with the wine, Cyprian tells us, "signifies the union betwixt Christ and believers," Epis. 63. Others say it represents the water and the blood which flowed from the wounded side of our blessed Lord—Athanasius says, "it typifies the union of the Eternal Word with the human nature." This last meaning is alluded to in the prayer following.

"that through the mystery of this water and wine you may be partakers of our Lord's divinity," if we understand its meaning correctly, which, in truth, is not very easy, namely, the partaking of our Lord's divinity through the mystery of this water and wine, appears to militate against some of your other doctrines; for it is only his divinity you pray to partake of—not his carnal body and blood—a doctrine not known when the prayer was made.

R.—In missa pro defunctis dicitur predicta oratio sed aqua non benedictur.

T.—In Masses for the dead, the above-mentioned prayer is said, but the water is not blessed.

Here, another novelty of your Church is introduced; "Masses for," and "praying for" the dead. You certainly cannot call this an apostolic doctrine, for you find nothing to sanction any such practice. Where our Lord commanded his apostles to teach all nations those things which he had commanded, Mat. xxviii. 20; and where he also promised that the Holy Spirit or the Paraclete whom he promised to send, would *bring all things which he had taught to their remembrance*, John xiv. 26; does it not appear strange, if such a practice were to be used, how the inspired apostles could be silent upon the subject? They *are* silent upon the subject, and therefore we conclude that such a practice becomes a species of *will-worship*, against which we are so forcibly cautioned by St. Paul, Col. ii. 18; imagining that we can improve the religion of the Gospel as taught by the Holy Ghost or God himself. We hear the apostles and our blessed Lord frequently speaking of prayer—exhorting us in numerous passages to pray for ourselves, and for our brethren. "Pray for one another," says St. James, v. 16; implying that our *prayers should be reciprocal*, as I endeavored to show in the preceding pages. Why then, as they so frequently alluded to the subject, did they not mention if prayers for the dead were necessary?

A natural consequence followed from this practice,

namely—the supposition that they were in some place in which they could be helped or assisted—and thus purgatory was introduced; and it was taught, that the souls of many who departed, and who were not guilty of sins sufficient to condemn them to hell forever, were consigned to a place called “purgatory,” from the Latin word “pурго,” to cleanse, and that there they remained until all their sins were atoned for. This doctrine led to another antisciptural belief, in the difference between mortal and venial sins, a distinction of which we find no trace in the word of God; and also to that which is alluded to in the preceding rubric, namely, “offering up Masses for the dead.” Upon reference to Church history, we shall discover that these several doctrines shortly followed each other, and were successively introduced into the public formularies.

With respect to the difference between “venial” and “mortal” sin, there is no sin venial in the sight of God. Sin has been defined by the apostle Paul, Rom. iv. 15, to be “a transgression of God’s law.” It is not so much, what we may consider the magnitude of the sin is displeasing to God, as the spirit, or disposition which prompts the commission. Thus, what was the offence of our first parents? only eating “fruit which was forbidden,” and still that one offence brought death, temporal and spiritual, upon the whole world. In Adam all die, 1 Cor. xv. 22. St. James tells us, “Now, whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet shall offend in one point, shall become guilty of all,” James ii. 10; and Paul says, Rom. iii. 19, “Now we know that what things soever the law speaketh, it speaketh to them that are in the law, that every mouth may be stopped.” God’s law has declared, “the soul that sinneth shall die,” Ezek. xiii. 4. No offence against the authority of an infinite Being can be a trivial offence. Our blessed Lord tells us that, “even for every idle word men speak, they shall render an account of it at the day of judgment,” Mat. xii. 36;\* where, then, are the grounds

\* Mark, for “idle words,” which your church calls venial sins, we

from Scripture for your making any such distinctions ? Where is the man who has not what you call mortal or deadly sin to repent of, and for which to seek pardon ? And if the blood of Christ can cleanse from greater sins, why should it be incapable of cleansing from lesser ?

Your Church has invented this distinction in order to prop up her doctrine of purgatory, which she teaches is a middle state between this present time and the day of judgment, in which the *temporal* punishment of mortal sin will be endured, and venial punished, until God's justice is satisfied.

Because we find that temporal judgments are inflicted in this world after God has forgiven the sin, as was the case of David, 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14, you conclude that those temporal penalties are carried on to the next world. Is this a doctrine of the Catholic Apostolic Church ? if so, we inquire where it is taught by our Lord or his holy Apostles ? Your Church quotes some passages in Scripture, none of which have any reference to purgatory, and if you believe they all refer to it, you will find they absolutely contradict each other. You defend the necessity of purgatory upon the principle " that God will render to every man according to his works," 2 Cor. v. 10 ; now what would be the consequence of this declaration being carried out literally with respect to us ? That no man living could be saved. You confess your unworthiness in the sight of God for your faults, your very grievous faults—and for what do you ask ? is it to be treated as you deserve ? no, but for mercy, for pardon—pardon undeserved by you, purchased for you by Jesus, God's beloved Son, by his own most precious blood. Such a doctrine would consign you to hell for ever, if Jesus did not interfere in your behalf.

You refer to Matt. xii. 32, where our Lord says, " But he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor the world to come ;" from which you conclude that there must account—not in purgatory—but at the day of judgment, when purgatory has ceased.

are sins which may be remitted in the world to come ; a very important conclusion from very insufficient premises. You refer again to another passage in support of purgatory, where our Lord says, Matt. v. 25 ; " Be at agreement with thy adversary quickly whiles thou art in the way with him, lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and thou be cast into prison, 26 ; amen I say unto thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till thou pay the last farthing." Both these passages, your Church says, refer to purgatory. In the one you say, sins may be forgiven in the next world ; in the other, that a person cannot come out thence, that is from purgatory, till he has paid the last farthing. Surely if sins are to be *forgiven*, payment for those sins is not required. If I forgive a debt, does it not seem absurd to *require payment to the last farthing* for that debt ? and yet such is the contradiction involved by the Roman interpretation of these two texts. The note in the Douay Testament, Matt. i. 25, upon the word "until," says, "these are ways of speech common among the Hebrews," as David says, Psalm cx.—" The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Both these texts imply perpetuity.

Your Church refers to 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, in support of this doctrine. This passage, we shall find, has nothing to do with the subject. In verse 11, St. Paul says, "for other foundation no man can lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ."\* Christ being the son of the living God was the foundation of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. " Now, if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be manifest ; for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

\* Not Peter, as you are falsely taught to believe.

What is meant here by the day of the Lord ? we shall find many passages to show that it refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and all those various persecutions to which the church was to be exposed. See Malachi iii. 2, 3 ; also iv. 1 ; Joel ii. 1, 30 ; 1 Thess. v. 2. It clearly cannot refer to the fire of purgatory, for then all would go there for a time, as *it was to try every man's work*, v. 13, even the blessed apostles and the Virgin Mary and all the saints of God would be subjected to it ; but this we know from various passages from God's word is not the case ; John tells us, 1 Epis. i. 7, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us *from all sin*," which includes both mortal and venial sins. All were to be tried by the fire of persecution, and their faults would thus be made manifest. If they built on Jesus, the one only sure foundation, though some of their doctrines may have been erroneous, signified by the words hay and stubble ; yet still, as their foundation was secure, they would be saved through that foundation, "yet so as by fire," as brands plucked from the fire, or persons escaping with their lives from a fire. The fire spoken of here, mark, was not to *punish*, but *to try*, to prove of what nature every man's work was ; and thus you see that this passage gives no sanction to your belief. The Roman purgatory is to *punish*, not to *try, or put to the test*.

A passage is also quoted from 1 Peter, iii. 18, &c. to prove the existence of purgatory. We shall find this passage, also, gives but little support to your church. "Because Christ also died for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God ;\* being put to death, indeed, in the flesh, but brought to life by the Spirit. In which, also, he came and preached to those spirits that were in prison, which had been sometime incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was building, wherein a few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." In this passage we are told by St. Peter, that Jesus, in

\* See here how Jesus *himself* offers the sinner to God for pardon, and does not require the assistance of the angels or saints.

order to bring us to God, suffered himself to be put to death in the flesh, but was brought to life by the Spirit, or Holy Spirit. St. Paul tells us the same thing; he says, Romans, viii. 11—"If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his spirit that dwelleth in you." Now, we shall find that this same spirit strove with man before the flood. We read, Gen. vi. 3—"And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, (to lead him from wickedness to holiness,) for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years, (that is, until the flood overspread the earth,) to give him time for repentance." They were said to be "*in prison*," which is a usual expression, descriptive of a person being in bondage to sin. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me," saith the Saviour, Luke, iv. 18, quoting from Isaiah, lxi. 1—"Wherefore, he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor. He hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart; to *preach deliverance to the captives*, and sight to the blind; to *set at liberty* them that are bound." We read, Isaiah, xlii. 7, that one of Christ's offices "is to open the blind eyes, to bring out the *prisoners from the prison*, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."

According to the doctrine of your church, these people were in purgatory, where our blessed Lord preached to them; and yet you say that purgatory is for *venial sins*. But these persons were guilty of mortal sin, for we read—"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth;" Gen. vi. 5, 12. Surely, then, according to your doctrines, they could not have been in purgatory. But the same apostle, whom you misunderstand in this passage, clears up the difficulty in his second epistle. He tells you, ii. 1, that there shall be lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and that heresies will be introduced into the church, on account of their not attending to that "*firm prophetic word*," namely, the Holy Scriptures, which St. Peter had recommended to them in the preceding chapter, v. 19—also, iii.

2. He proceeds then, v. 4, to show the certainty of God's judgments upon such—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but delivered them to infernal ropes, drawn down to the lower hell, unto torments, to be reserved unto judgment, and spared not the original world, but preserved Noe, the eighth person, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly ; and reducing the cities of the Sodomites and of the Gomorrhites into ashes, condemned them to be overthrown, making them an example to those that should after act wickedly." He, then, in verse 9, says—"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, but *to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be tormented.*" Can any thing be clearer than that those unhappy persons were not in purgatory—that place invented by the Roman Church, where their sins could be atoned for by their sufferings—but in a place where their condemnation was without remedy, to which the benefits of the atonement of Jesus were not to reach, being made an example, as St. Jude tells us, v. 7, suffering the punishment of eternal fire. Can any thing be more clear, than that your church, in order to prop up her false system, has perverted the meaning of the entire passage ?

You quote, also, in support of your system, from the 2d Mac. xii. 45, to justify praying for the dead. Without taking advantage of this book not being admitted into the canon of Scripture by the Jews, and that, consequently, it can never be counted amongst those "oracles of God," the Holy Scriptures, which were intrusted to the Jews, as St. Paul tells us, Romans, iii. 2 ; without either proving from another passage how the author must be a most dangerous guide, where he praises the act of suicide, xiv. 42 ; or self-destruction, and thus making it appear that he is just as likely to mislead as a teacher in one respect as in another ; he says, describing the particulars of the death of Razes, v. 46, "When, as his blood was now quite gone, he plucked out his bowels, and taking them in both his hands, he cast them upon the throng, and, calling upon the Lord of life and spirit to restore him those again, he thus died."

But your church, in the exercise of her claimed infallibility, has invested this book with an importance the author of it never contemplated. He tells his readers, ii. 23 ; that it is only an abridgment of the five books written by Jason. He tells you, v. 26—"Therefore, to us that have taken upon us this painful labor of abridging, it was not easy, but a matter of sweat and watching." In his preface, which continues to the end of the second chapter, we find not a word said respecting divine assistance or spiritual illumination ; he speaks as if he were writing an ordinary volume. In the early list of canonical works, we do not find this book mentioned with the others, by the ancient council of Laodicea, held in the fourth century, nor by the early writers of the church. We reject the book, therefore, as possessing no authority whatever. But, besides, even upon your own principles, this passage should possess no weight. Those persons for whom Judas Maccabeus, as is stated, prayed, were idolaters, and died in mortal sin, and therefore should not have been prayed for. Their idols, as we are informed, xii. 40, were found under their coats, which the law, Deuteronomy, vii. 25, 26, expressly forbids ; and thus, with the most unaccountable inconsistency, you are taught to disobey the precepts of that book which your church declares to be the Word of God, and of equal authority with any other book of Holy Scripture. I leave your church to get out of this difficulty, and to justify her disobedience to what she calls the Word of God.

There is a question upon this subject I would propose. You are in the practice of saying the "Hail Mary;" at the conclusion of the prayer, you say, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us now and at the hour of our death." Why do you not solicit her to pray for you *after death*, as well as when you are dying ? Surely, the intercession of the Virgin is as powerful at one time as at the other. You are taught in your Catechism, that it was your church added this petition for her to pray for you at the hour of death. Why did not your church, at the same time, add a petition for her inter-

cession after death? *The reason is plain: no such doctrine existed, at the time when this prayer was added, as purgatory.* The invocation of saints preceded purgatory by several centuries—a doctrine which many of your own writers admit has no *scriptural support*, and has nothing to uphold it but the bold, presumptuous claim to infallibility, which we have seen rests but upon such a sandy foundation.

There was a species of prayer for the dead, which, we find, prevailed very early. We are taught in the word of God, that there are, if we may so express ourselves, two resurrections—the first, of the soul only, when it awakes to a state of consciousness after its separation from the body, and when it goes to that place alluded to by our Lord, where he says to the thief upon the cross, Luke, xxiii. 43, “this day thou shalt be with me in paradise.” And the second resurrection, or more properly, perhaps, *the* resurrection, is that of the body, and its reunion with the soul; to which St. Paul alludes, when he says, 1 Cor. xv. 52, “In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise again incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” He says, also, in verse 42, speaking of the resurrection of the body, “it is sown in corruption, and it is raised in incorruption.” See also Phil. iii. 21. Thus we see there are two periods spoken of in the liturgy of the church of England and Ireland—this latter period is alluded to in the Litany; we call upon God to deliver us at the hour of death, and at the day of judgment—and again, when we pray in our burial service for “perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul, in God’s eternal and everlasting glory.” It was the not keeping these two periods distinct, which led to the error of praying for the dead, or supposing that any thing we can do for them after they have departed, will better their condition.

It would be impossible, within a small compass, to bring forward all the passages from Scripture which tell us that as we are at the hour of our death, so shall

we be to all eternity, so far as our pardon and forgiveness are concerned.

There is only one more passage I will quote, because St. John was *specially commanded to commit it to writing*, Rev. xiv. 13 ; "I heard a voice from heaven, saying to me, Write, 'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth ; now saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labor.' " Is there any intimation here of purgatory, or a place of punishment ? Nothing of the kind ; those who die in the Lord, in the faith of Jesus, have their sins forgiven—they rest from their labors—their troubles and sorrows are at an end.

Now, we ask, as purgatory is to be at an end, when the day of judgment arrives, and as we know upon the authority of God's word, 1 Thes. iv. 17 ; which we also declare in the Creed,\* that some will be alive upon earth when that tremendous day arrives, how can they be purified of venial sins, without purgatory ?—and if they can, as there is no purgatory at that time, where is the necessity of your church inventing such a place ? Notwithstanding these contradictions, your church teaches that there is a purgatory, and that those who are there, are assisted and helped by the prayers and good works of the faithful upon earth, and by the sacrifice of the Mass. We have shown you that such a doctrine has no warrant from the word of God ; and that those passages which you bring forward have no reference whatever to such a place.

Your church tells you that there is a middle state between heaven and hell, and that those who are too good for hell, and not sufficiently righteous for heaven, are sent into this middle place, in order to be qualified for eternal happiness. From the preceding pages you may learn how such a doctrine opposes the Gospel plan of man's salvation, which is the free and unmerited gift of God. The passages from the Holy Scriptures, which I have brought before you, prove, most clearly, that it is the blood of Jesus alone which cleanses from

\* He sitteth at the right hand of God, from thence he shall come to judge the *quick*, those then alive, and the dead.

sin. And in all the parables of our Blessed Lord, and in all his teachings, as recorded by his inspired apostles, and in all the instructions given us by those apostles themselves, we find only two places spoken of—heaven and hell. Into the one the wicked will be cast—to the other the faithful servants of the Lord Jesus will be exalted. The parable of the tares, or cockle, Mat. xiii. 24; the net, Mat. xiii. 48; the unmerciful servant, Mat. xviii. 23; the careless servant, Mat. xxiv. 45; the sheep and the goats, Mat. xxv. 31; the ten virgins, xxv. 1; and many others—all show that there are but two places—heaven and hell. Look to those passages, and judge for yourselves.

Surely our Blessed Lord and his inspired apostles must have been very insufficient teachers, to have left such an important doctrine untaught and unmentioned in that sacred volume which is able to “make the man of God *perfect*”—as St. Paul tells us, “furnished to every good work,” 2 Tim. iii. 17. Because there is a *middle space of time* between the present and the day of judgment, your church *wilfully* confuses that with a *middle place*. Mark the distinction—there is a *middle space* of time, but not a *middle or third place*. There are only a place of happiness and a place of misery now, but that happiness and that misery will be increased after the day of judgment. The councils of Florence and of Trent—the former held more than 1400 years—the latter more than 1500 after the birth of our Blessed Lord, made the only authoritative deerees upon this subject, and of the means by which the suffering souls may be assisted. Prayers for the dead, as we have before stated, long preceded the doctrine of purgatory. Thus, in what is called “the apostolical constitutions,” prayers are offered up even for the Blessed Virgin Mary; and your church will not admit, I am sure, that she was in purgatory.

There is a false church spoken of in the book of Revelation, and the destruction of that church is clearly foretold; and one of the marks of that church is her *making merchandise of the souls of men*, Rev. xviii. 13.

Can there be any other church to which it applies but the church of Rome ; who, by her doctrine of purgatory, and by persuading you that there is such a place, and that she has power to deliver from that place by prayers and by Masses, for which you are compelled to pay, carries on a most profitable traffic, and thus makes merchandise of the souls of her people ? To enter into the various prophecies in the Holy Scriptures, which describe your church and its errors, and clearly foretel her downfall, would lead me from my present purpose.

R.—Postea accipit calicem et offert, dicens.

T.—He next takes the chalice, and offers it, saying—

R.—Offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem salutaris, tuam deprecantes clementiam ; ut in conspectu divinæ majestatis tuæ pro nostra et totius mundi salute cum odore suavitatis ascendat. Amen.

T.—We offer to thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching your compassion, that it may ascend as a sweet odor in the sight of thy divine Majesty, for our salvation, and that of the whole world. Amen.

Here again we inquire, upon what authority does your church present to God plain wine and plain water, mingled together, as an atonement for sin, and for man's salvation ?—for, upon your own principles, this must be the case, the prayer of consecration not being yet said.

R.—Deinde facit signum crucis cum calice et illam ponit super corporale et palla cooperit tum junctis manibus super altare aliquantulum inclinatus dicit.

T.—Then he makes the sign of the cross with the chalice, and places it upon the corporale, and covers it with a napkin ; then joining his hands upon the altar, and bending himself a little towards it, he says—

R.—In spiritu humilitatis, et in animo contrito, suscepiamur a te Domine ; et sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie, ut placeat tibi, Domine Deus.

T.—May we be received with a spirit of humility, and with a contrite heart, by thee, O Lord God ; and

may our sacrifice be made this day in thy sight, O Lord God, so as to be acceptable to thee.

R.—Erectus expandit manus easque in altum porrectas jungens, elevatur ad cœlum oculis, et statim demissis dieit.

T.—Raising himself up, he stretches out his hands on high, and then joins them together, raising his eyes to heaven, and immediately looking down, he says—

Where in the Word of God do we find these rules for the management of our hands and eyes in prayer? How applicable to such practices is the passage from God's word :—"This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; and in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men," Mat. xv. 8, 9.

R.—Veni, sanetificator, omnipotens æterne Deus, (benedicit oblata prosequendo,) et benedic hoc sacrificium tuo nomini sancto præparatum.

T.—Come, O Eternal, Almighty God, the sanetifier, (he here blesses the oblations in succession,) and bless (here makes the sign of the cross) this sacrifice prepared for your holy name.

R.—Postea si solemniter celebrat benedicit incensum dicens.

T.—Afterwards, if he celebrates a solemn high Mass, he blesses the incense, saying—

R.—Per intercessionem beati Michaelis archangeli stantis a dextris altaris incensi et omnium electorum suorum, incensum istud dignetur, Dominus bene ✠ dicere, et in ordorem suavitatis accipere. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—Through the intercession of the blessed Michael the archangel, standing at the right side of the altar of incense, and of all his elect, may the Lord vouchsafe to bless (he makes the sign of the cross) this incense, and to receive it as a sweet-smelling savor, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

We were told before that the incense was blessed,

we may have supposed once was sufficient, but here you pray may the Lord again bless it. Where did you learn that Michael the archangel had any influence with God to procure this second blessing ? and then the prayer concludes, as if you were conscious of the uselessness, to say no worse of it, of any such intercession, by saying, “ through Jesus Christ our Lord,” as if you knew it was through Jesus only, any supplication will be attended to. Oh ! why are you guilty of such unscriptural practices ?

R.—Et accepto thuribulo a diacono incensat oblata, modo in rubricis generalibus prescripto dicens.

T.—And having received the incense vessel from the deacon, he incenses the oblation in the manner prescribed in the general rubrics, saying—

R.—Incensum istud a te benedictum, ascendat ad te Domine, et descendat super nos misericordia tua.

T.—May that incense, blessed by you, ascend to thee, O Lord, and may your compassion descend upon us.

R.—Deinde incensat altare dicens.

T.—Then he incenses the altar, saying—

Psalm cxl.—Dirigatur Domine, oratio mea, sicut incensum in conspectu tuo, elevatio manuum mearum sacrificium vespertinum. Pone Domine custodium ori meo, et ostium circumstantiae labiis meis, ut non declinet cor meum in verba malitiae ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis.

T.—May my prayer, O Lord, be directed as incense in thy sight, and may the lifting up of my hands be as the evening sacrifice. Place, O Lord, a watch upon my mouth, and a door of watchfulness upon my lips, so that my heart may not incline to words of malice, and to making excuses for my faults.

R.—Dum reddit thuribulum Diacono dicit.

T.—While he gives back the incense vessel to the deacon, he says—

R.—Accendat in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris et flammarum æternæ charitatis. Amen.

T.—May the Lord kindle in us the fire of his love and the flame of eternal charity. Amen.

R.—Postea incensatur sacerdos Diacono ; deinde alii per ordinem. Interim sacerdos lavat manus dicens.

T.—After this, the priest is incensed by the deacon ; then the others, according to their rank. In the mean while, the priest washes his hands, saying—

PSALMUS XXV.

Lavabo inter innocentes manus meas ; et circumdabo altare tuum, Domine.

Ut audiam vocein laudis ; et enarrem universa mirabilia tua.

Domine, dilexi decorem domûs tuæ, et locum habitationis gloriæ tuæ.

Ne perdas cum impiis, Deus, animam meam, et cum viris sanguinum vitam meam.

In quorum manibus iniuriae sunt, dextera eorum repleta est muneribus.

Ego autem in innocentia meâ ingressus sum, redime me et miserere mei.

Pes meus stetit in directo ; in ecclesiis benedic te, Domine.

Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto. Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

PSALM XXV.—TRANSLATION.

I will wash my hands among the innocent, and I will repair to thine altar ;

That I may hear the voice of praise, and tell forth all thy wonderful things.

Lord, I have loved the beauty of thine house, and the place of the habitation of thy glory.

Do not destroy my soul, O God, with the wicked, and my life with men of blood ;

In whose hands are wickedness ; their right hand is full of gifts.

But I have entered in mine innocency ; redeem me and have compassion upon me.

My foot hath stood in the right path ; I will bless thee,  
O Lord, in thy temples.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the  
Holy Ghost : as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever  
shall be, world without end. Amen.

R.—In missis pro defunctis et tempore passionis in  
missis de tempore omittitur “Gloria Patri.” Deinde  
aliquantulum inclinatus in medio altaris junctis manibus  
super eo dicit.

T.—In Masses for the dead, and during the time of  
Easter or the Passion, and in Masses at particular  
times, “the Gloria Patri” is omitted ; then the priest  
bending himself a little in the middle of the altar, having  
joined his hands over it, says—

R.—Suscipe, sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, quam  
tibi offerimus ob memoriam passionis resurrectionis et  
ascensionis Jesu Christi, Domini nostri, et in honorem  
beatæ Mariæ semper Virginis, et beati Johannis Bap-  
tistæ et sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, et isto-  
rum et omnium sanctorum ; ut illis proficiat ad hono-  
rem, nobis autem ad salutem, et illi pro nobis interce-  
dere dignentur in cœlis, quorum memoriam agimus\* in  
terris. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum.  
Amen.

T.—Receive, O blessed Trinity, this oblation which  
we offer to thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection,  
and ascension of Jesus Christ, our Lord, and in honor  
of the Blessed Mary ever a Virgin, and of the blessed  
John the Baptist, and of the blessed apostles, Peter and  
Paul, and of these and all the saints, that it may ad-  
vance their honor and our salvation, and that they may  
vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory

\* Here we see traces of the primitive practice respecting the saints  
and martyrs ; the ancient church had annual commemorations of them,  
that the survivors may be excited, through divine grace, to follow their  
examples of holy living. No person thought of praying to them in  
those days, or soliciting their intercession. The primitive Christians  
depended, as they were taught by the apostles in their inspired writings,  
upon only one Mediator, who is now at the right hand of God,  
to make intercession for his people.

we preserve on earth, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

We have some remarks to make upon this prayer, the meaning of which we do not understand. How the oblation of the bread and the wine, mixed with water, can be offered to the blessed Trinity, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, we can comprehend—but how this oblation can be made in honor of the Blessed Virgin, or of any apostle or saint, we really cannot understand—and how such an offering can redound to our salvation—how bread and wine offered up to God can advance our salvation, or honor the saints, we know not. Where is such an extraordinary doctrine or practice taught in Scripture? Nothing of the kind was known in the ancient church. The church to which you belong is bound to give you full information upon this subject, and to explain their reason for introducing a prayer utterly irreconcilable with Gospel truth and common sense.

R.—Postea osculatur altare et versus ad populum extendens et jungens manus, voce paululum elevata dicit.

T.—Then he kisses the altar, and turning to the people, extending and joining his hands, he says, in a voice moderately loud—

R.—Orate, fratres, ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem.

T.—Pray, brethren, that mine and your sacrifice may be acceptable with God, the Father Almighty.

R.—Minister seu circumstantes respondent, alioquin ipsemet sacerdos.

T.—The clerk or those who stand around, otherwise the priest himself, says—

R.—Suscipiat Dominus sacrificium de manibus tuis, (vel meis,) ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui, ad utilitatem quoque nostram, totiusque ecclesiæ suæ sanctæ.

T.—May the Lord receive this sacrifice from your hands, (or mine,) to the praise and glory of his name, and for our benefit, and that of the whole Church.

R.—Sacerdos submissa voce dicit—Amen.

T.—The priest says then with a low voice—Amen.

R.—Deinde manibus extensis absolute sine “Oremus,” subjungit orationes secretas. Quibus finitis cum pervenerit ad conclusionem clara voce dicit. Per omnia sæcula sæculorum cum prefatione, ut in sequentibus. Prefatio incipitur ambabus manibus positis hinc inde super altare. Quos aliquantulum elevat cum dicit “sursum corda,” jungit eas ante pectus et caput inclinat, cum dicit “gratias agimus Domino Deo nostro.” Deinde disjungit manus et disjunetas tenet usque ad finem prefationis. Qua finita, iterum jungit eas et inclinatus dicit “sanctus,” et cum dicit “benedictus qui venit,” signum crucis sibi producit a fronte ad pectus.

T.—Then his hands widely extended, without saying—“Let us pray,” he repeats the secret prayers; (*these the people cannot hear,*) which being finished, when he comes to the end he says with a loud voice—“for ever and ever” with the preface, as is mentioned in the “sequences,” which are different on different days—the preface is begun, both hands being placed separately over the altar. He raises them a little when he says, “lift up your hearts.” He then joins them before his breast, and bows his head, when he says, “we give thee thanks, O Lord, our God.” Then he separates his hands and holds them separate until the end of the preface—which being ended, he joins them again, and bowing says “the sanctus,” or the prayer commencing with the word “sanctus,” or holy; and when he says “blessed is he that comes,” he makes the sign of the cross from his forehead to his breast.

The preface being different at different periods of the year, we shall only give one of them; and we would here remark how utterly useless all these forms which the priest uses appear, and how unmeaning are the various attitudes into which he is taught, by rule, to put himself—when we consider the object and design of prayer.

R.—Sequens Prefatio dicitur a nativitate Domini

usque ad Epiphaniam (præterquam in die S. Johannis Apostoli) et in purificatione B. Mariæ et in festo Corporis Christi et per octavam, nisi in ea occurrit festum, quod propriam prefationem habet et in transfiguratione Domini.

T.—The following preface is said from the nativity of our Lord to the Epiphany, (except upon the Octave or eighth day of St. John the Apostle,) and also in the purification of the blessed Mary, and in the feast of Corpus Christi, or of the body of Christ, and through the Octave to the eighth day after; unless a festival occurs, which has its own proper preface; and also in the transfiguration of our Lord :—

PRIEST.—Per omnia sæcula sæculorum.

T.—For ever and ever.

RESPONSE.—Amen.

P.—Dominus vobiscum.

T.—The Lord be with you.

R.—Et cum spiritu tuo.

T.—And with thy spirit.

P.—Sursum corda.

T.—Lift up your hearts.

R.—Habemus ad Dominum.

T.—We lift them up unto the Lord.

P.—Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro.

T.—Let us give thanks to our Lord God.

R.—Dignum et justum est.

T.—It is just and right to do so

Vere dignum et justum est, æquum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater Omnipotens, æterne Deus. Quia per incarnationis verbi mysterium nova mentes nostræ oculis lux tuæ claritatis in fulsit ut dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus per hunc invisibilium amorem rapiamur. Et ideo cum angelis et archangelis cum thronis et dominationibus cumque enim militia cœlestis exercitus hymnum gloriæ tuæ canimus sine fine dicentes—

T.—It is truly proper, and right, and just, and healthful, that we should give thanks to thee always and everywhere, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Eternal God, because through the mystery of the incarnate Word, a new light of your glory has shone upon the eyes of our mind, so that while we behold God visibly we are carried away by this love of invisible things; and, therefore, with the angels and archangels, with thrones and dominions, and with all the army of the heavenly host, we sing forth the hymn of your praise, saying :—

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth.

T.—Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, (or of Hosts.)

Pleni sunt cœli et terra, gloriæ tuæ, Hosanna in excelsis.

T.—The heavens and earth are full of thy glory, Hosanna in the highest.

R.—Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini, Hosanna in excelsis.

T.—Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest.

We now come to what is called the “CANON OF THE MASS;” the most solemn part of the service.

R.—Sacerdos extendens et jungens manus, elevans ad cælum oculos, et statim demittens profunde inclinatus ante altare, manibus super eo positis, dicit.

T.—The priest standing, and joining his hands, and raising his eyes to the heavens, and immediately casting them down, bending himself very low before the altar, and placing his hands over it, says :—

PRIEST.—Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum, Filium tuum, Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus ac petimus, (osculatur altare,) uti, accepta habeas et benedicas, (jungat manus deinde signet ter super oblata,) hæc  $\text{+}$  dona, hæc  $\text{+}$  munera, hæc  $\text{+}$  sancta sacrificia illibata, (extensis manibus prosequitur,) in primis, quæ tibi offerimus pro ecclesia tua

sancta Catholica, quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris, toto orbe terrarum, una cum famulo tuo papa nostro, N. et antistite nostro N. et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus.

T.—We, as suppliants, beseech thee, O merciful Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, thy Son, our Lord, (he here kisses the altar,) that thou mayest hold and bless these  $\ddagger$  gifts, (let him then join his hands, and after that make the sign of the cross three times upon the oblation,) these  $\ddagger$  offerings, these holy  $\ddagger$  sacrifices poured out, (he proceeds then with extended hands,) chiefly which we offer to thee for thy holy Catholie Church; which may you vouchsafe to keep in peace, to watch over, and unite in one, and govern all over the world, together with your servant N. our pope, (or father,) and our bishop N., and with all the orthodox worshippers of the Catholic and Apostolic faith.

R.—Commemoratio pro vivis.

T.—Commemoration for the living.

P.—Memento, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuorum N. et N. Jungit manus orat aliquantulum pro quibus orare intendit, deinde manibus extensis prosequitur. Et omnium circumstantium, quorum tibi fides cognita est, et nota devotio, pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis, pro se suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolumitatis suæ, tibique reddunt vota sua æterno Deo, vivo et vero.

T.—Remember, O Lord, thy servants, and thy handmaidens, N. and N. He here joins his hands, and prays for a little while for those he intends to pray for; then extending his hands, he proceeds. And also all those here present, whose faith is approved of by thee, and whose devotion is known, for whom we make this offering, or who offer to thee this saerifice of praise for themselves and all their families, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of salvation, and of their safety,

and for which they pay their vows to thee, the eternal, living, and true God.\*

Next follows the part of the service called the “*Infra actionem.*” The commencement of part of this prayer is different upon different festivals. The following part is used on all occasions :—

P.—Communicantes et memoriam venerantes, impribus gloriosæ semper Virginis Mariæ, Genitricis Dei et Domini nostri Jesu Christi; sed et beatorum Apostolorum ac Martyrum tuorum, Petri et Pauli, Andreæ, Jacobi, Joannis, Thomæ, Jacobi, Philippi, Bartholomæi, Matthæi, Simonis et Thadæi, Lini, Cleti, Clementis, Xysti, Cornelii, Cypriani, Laurentii, Chrysogoni, Joannis et Pauli, Cosmæ et Damiani, et omnium tuorum Sanctorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio. (Jungit manus,) per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—Communicating with, and venerating the memory in the first place, of the glorious Mary, ever a virgin, the mother of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also of thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, Jaines, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Thadeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprianus, Laurentius, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and of all thy Saints, by whose merits and prayers mayest thou grant that in all things we may be fortified by the help of thy protection, (he here joins his hands,) through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

It is unnecessary, after all that has been said upon the subject of praying to saints, and depending upon their intercession or merits, to make any comment upon that part of this most extraordinary and inconsistent prayer. The first part of the prayer is sanctioned by the ancient church, which was in the practice of commemorating the deaths and martyrdoms of the primitive

\* The Eucharist was called, by the Primitive Church, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—not a sacrifice for sin, as your church ~~now~~ teaches.

saints, as we remarked before. And in the prayer for the Church Militant, the Reformed Established Church has an allusion to this early custom, where it is said, "And we bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good example, that, with them, we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom." But your Church is not content with this, but calls upon God to protect us by "their merits and prayers." Your church not only here asks for their intercession, but beseeches Almighty God by their merits. What authority have you for doing this? And then, with the most unaccountable inconsistency, you conclude with saying, "through the same Jesus Christ our Lord." We inquire again, are not the merits of Jesus sufficient? is not the intercession of Jesus sufficient? But you must needs add to them the merits of the apostles, which we know they must disclaim, as our blessed Lord taught them to do, Luke xvii. 10; and also the merits of a number of individuals, of whom you know nothing but the names, and some of whom, for aught you can tell to the contrary, may have had but small pretensions to the character of saints, however called so, or canonized by the Pope or Bishop of Rome; and, only it would lead us from our present subject, we would bring forward proofs of this fact.

Why do you call the Virgin, "*the mother of God?*" Where, in the sacred page of Scripture, is she given such a title? She was the mother of our Lord—but only in his human capacity. There is but one God, and three Persons constitute the Godhead. Surely she was not the mother of the Father, or of the Holy Ghost. The Lord Jesus Christ left the bosom of the Father, and took upon him the nature of man, and it is only in this respect—as man—that the blessed Virgin is his mother; but such is the anti-scriptural anxiety of the Roman Church to justify the invocation of saints, and particularly of the Virgin, that she has invented this title, "*Mother of God*, for the Virgin; to justify her idolatry, as possessing a divine nature, or doctrine, which

has no foundation whatever in the writings of the inspired apostles, and was never given to her by the primitive church.

R.—Tenens manus expansas super oblata, dicit.

T.—Holding his hands extended over the oblations, he says—

R.—Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ quæsumus Domini, ut placatus accipias ; diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab æterna damnatione nos eripi, et electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari, (jungit manus,) per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—We beseech thee, therefore, O Lord, that thou mayest favorably receive this offering of our service and of all thy family, and that thou mayest dispose our days in thy peace, and that thou mayest command us to be delivered from eternal condemnation, and numbered in the flock of thine elect, (he joins his hands,) through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Does it not appear most extraordinary to have some of your prayers perfectly scriptural, as if the intercession of Jesus were sufficient, and to have others contradicting this supposition ? Is it not an open insult to Jesus, the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, to be spoken of in one prayer as if he were the *only* mediator, the *only* intercessor with his father, through whom your supplications will be granted, and immediately after, as if you disbelieved that his mediation were sufficient, to call for the additional mediation of those saints who were created and saved by him alone ? May God of his infinite mercy open your eyes, my Roman Catholic brethren, and cause you to see the errors of your faith. It is thus implied that other intercessors are necessary, and that without those additional mediators your petitions will not be granted ; consequently those prayers in which no mention is made of the saints' interference as joint intercessors, are incomplete : away with such wickedness.

P.—Quam oblationem tu, Deus ! in omnibus quæsu-

mus (signat ter super oblata) bene  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  dictam, ad  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  scriptam, ra  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  tam rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris, (signat semel super hostiam ac semel super calicem,) ut nobis Cor  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  pus et San  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  guis fiat dilectissimi Filii tu Domini nostri Jesus Christi.

T.—Which oblation do thou, O God, we beseech thee vouchsafe (the priest makes the sign of the cross three times over the oblations) to bless  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$ , to approve  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$ , ratify  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$ , and accept, (he makes the sign of the cross once over the host and once over the chalice,) that it may become to us the body  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  and the blood  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  of thy most beloved son Jesus Christ our Lord.

P.—Qui pridie quam pateretur (accipit hostiam) accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, (*elevat oculos ad cælum*,) et elevatis oculis in cælum, ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens, (*signat super hostiam*,) bene  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$  dixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens. Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes.

T.—Who, the evening before he suffered, (he here takes up the host,) took bread into his holy and venerable hands, (he here raises his eyes to heaven,) and lifting up his eyes to heaven, to thee his almighty Father, giving thee thanks, (he here makes the sign of the cross over the host,) he blessed  $\text{\tfrac{X}{+}}$ , brake, and gave to his disciples, saying—Take and eat this, all of you.

We shall have some remarks to make hereafter about the word “*all*” being introduced here, which is not to be found in your own Testament.

R.—Tenens ambabus manibus hostiam inter indices et pallices profert verba consecrationis, secreto, distinete, et attento.

T.—Holding the host with both his hands between his forefingers and thumbs, he says the words of consecration secretly, distinctly, and attentively, or with intention—

**HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM.—FOR THIS IS MY BODY.**

R.—Problatis verbis consecrationis, statim hostiam

consecratam genuflexus adorat. Surgit, ostendit populo, reponit super corporale, iterum adorat. Et non disjungit pollices et indices nisi quando Hostia tractanda est usque ad ablutionem digitorum. Tunc detecto calice dicit.

T.—Having finished the words of consecration, immediately kneeling down, he adores the consecrated host. He then rises up, shows it to the people, and places it upon the corporale and again adores it. And he does not separate his fingers and thumbs, only when the host is to be laid down, until the oblation, or washing of his fingers. Then, uncovering the chalice, he says—

R.—Simili modo postquam cœnatum est (ambabus manibus accipit calicem) accipiens et hunc præclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas ; item tibi gratias agens (sinistra tenens Calicem dextera signat super eum) bene dixit deditque discipulis suis, dicens —Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes.

T.—In like manner, when supper was ended, (the priest takes the chalice with both his hands,) taking this glorious chalice also into his holy and venerable hands, likewise giving thanks to thee, (holding the chalice in his left hand, with the right he makes the sign of the cross upon it,) he blessed  $\text{\textt{IHS}}$  and gave it to his disciples, saying—Take and drink ye all of this.

R.—Profert verba consecrationis secreto super calicem tenens illum parum elevatum.

T.—He then says the words of consecration secretly over the chalice, holding it raised up a little.

**HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI NOVI ET ÆTERNI TESTAMENTI MYSTERIUM FIDEI, QUÆ PRO NOBIS ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM.**

T.—For this is the chalice of my blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of the faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins.

R.—Prolatis verbis consecrationis deponit calicem

super corporale et dicens secreto, "Hoc, quotiescumque faceritis in mei memoriam facietis."

Genusflexus adorat, surgit, ostendit populo, deponit, cooperit, et iterum adorat. Deinde disjunget manibus dicit.

T.—Having finished the words of consecration, he places the chalice upon the corporale, also saying, secretly—"As often as you shall do these things, you shall do them in remembrance of me." Kneeling down, he adores it—rises up, shows it to the people; lays it down, covers it, and again adores it; then having separated his hands, he says—

Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua saneta, ejusdem Christi Filii tui Domini nostri tam beatæ passionis, neenon, et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in cœlos gloriæ ascensionis, offerimus præclaræ Majestati tuæ, de tuis donis ac datis, (jungit manus et signat ter super hostiam et calicem simul,) hostiam  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  puram, hostiam  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  sanctam, hostiam  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  immaculatam, (signat semel super hostiam et semel super calicem,) panem  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  sanctum vitæ æternæ et calicem  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  salutis perpetuæ.

T.—Wherefore, also, O Lord, we, thy servants, and thine holy people, being mindful of the blessed passion of the same Christ, our Lord, and also of his resurrection from the dead,  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  and also of his glorious ascension into heaven, offer to thy divine Majesty, of thy gifts, bestowed upon us, (he joins his hands, and makes the sign of the cross three times upon the host and chalice at the same time,) a pure  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  host, a holy  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  host, an unspotted  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  host, (he makes the sign of the cross once over the host and once over the chalice,) the holy  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  bread of eternal life, and the chalice  $\text{\tfrac{X}{P}}$  of everlasting salvation.

R.—Extensis manibus prosequitur.

He continues with his hands extended.

Supra quæ, propitio ac sereno vultu respicere, digneris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium patriarchæ

nostri Abraham, et quod tibi summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, obtulit sanctum sacrificium, immaculatum hostiam.

T.—Upon which vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as thou vouchsafed to accept the gifts of thy righteous servant, Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch, Abraham, and what the high priest, Melchisedech, offered to thee, a holy sacrifice, an unspotted host or victim.

R.—Profunde inclinatus junctis manibus, et super altare positis, dicit.

T.—Bowing lowly with his hands joined, and placed upon the altar, he says—

Suplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube hæc perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinæ Majestatis tuæ; ut quotquot (osculatur altare) ex hac altaris participatione sacro-sanctum Filii tui, (jungit manus et signat simul super hostiam et simul super calicem,) cor  $\ddagger$  pus et san  $\ddagger$  guinem sumpserimus, (seipsum signat,) omni benedictione cœlesti et gratia repleamur. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—We, as suppliants, beseech thee, O Omnipotent God, to command that these things (namely: the oblation of what your church calls the body and blood of Christ) may be carried by the hands of thy holy angel to thine altar on high, in the sight of thy divine Majesty, that as many of us (he here kisses the altar) as shall have taken, by the participation of this altar, of the most sacred body  $\ddagger$  and blood  $\ddagger$  of thy Son, (he joins his hands, and makes the sign of the cross once upon the host and once upon the chalice, then crosses himself,) may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace, through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

This part of your service is considered to be the most important: and contains much to be remarked upon. We discover various grounds for serious charges against your church, which has thought fit to change the entire design of the Lord's Supper, and has substituted

instead thereof a number of prayers and forms unknown in Scripture, unheard-of in the ancient church, and utterly inconsistent with each other. The first remark we shall here make, is your not using bread as our Lord did—you who pretend to follow every thing so very literally. He, as you quote in your prayer of consecration, took bread and broke it, and gave it to his disciples. Why do you, in this respect, depart from antiquity? Again, he told them to take and eat it. The Latin word which you translate “eat” is “manducate,” which signifies “to chew,” to break with the teeth. But, contrary to this express command, you desire your communicants not “to chew” but “to swallow;” and this they could not do so conveniently, if they had not thin wafers. Now we are told that our blessed Lord took bread and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, Luke xxii. 19. Of course we are to suppose he held a loaf or a large piece of bread in his hands, and so broke off pieces of it and gave them to his disciples. And, in accordance with this view, Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 17, “all partake of one bread.” The *one loaf* is typical of the body of Christ broken for believers, representing the unity of his mystical body. Epiphanius tells us that these loaves used at the celebration of the Eucharist were round, and divided amongst the communicants. Justin Martyr tells us, in the passage we quoted before, that bread, or loaves, is brought to the bishop for the communicants. The change gradually crept into the church, although the 16th Council of Toledo, 6 canon, held A. D. 693, endeavored to provide against this abuse, and brought forward the passages from Scripture quoted above, to show that our Lord made use of a whole loaf. In the eleventh century, the practice of using wafers became general, though greatly opposed, as we find by reference to church history. And in this your church has acted consistently, when she taught them the new doctrine of transubstantiation, as we shall see. Again, our blessed Lord said, “Take this,” but you do not permit your people to touch it with their hands; they open

their mouths, and the priest places a wafer upon the tongue of each. Here you have three practices, all unknown in the ancient church—1, contrary to what our blessed Lord did, the use of whole or entire wafers, instead of bread broken—2, the not eating or chewing the bread or wafer—and 3, the communicant not taking it in his hand, but only opening his mouth to receive it on his tongue.

The priest goes on to pray that the oblations, that is, the bread and wine, may become the body and the blood of our Lord. He then takes the Host, and repeats the words of our Lord, as recorded in the Gospels, in which your church has presumed to make a change, for we find it stated nowhere that our Lord commanded *all* to eat the bread; thus blasphemously introducing an expression into the language of our Lord, nowhere to be found in the Holy Scriptures, even in your own translations, for the purpose of justifying your practice of withholding the cup from the laity, and of neutralizing the force of the word "*all*," used by our Lord when he gave the wine.

Then the priest repeats what your church now teaches is "the prayer of consecration," and this secretly to himself: "*hoc est enim corpus meum*"—"for this is my body." Your church now asserts that the bread has become the body of our Lord; and the consequence is, that the priest immediately falls down and worships what he holds in his hands, and you all foolishly and impiously do the same. He proceeds then to consecrate the wine, using the words which are to be found in your Testament, *secretly*, that is, to himself only; and then he falls down and worships what your church teaches you has become the blood of our Lord.

And now I inquire, why does the priest repeat these words *secretly*, and to himself alone? Here is another departure from Scripture, for our Lord spoke aloud. Is it not sufficient for you to have your services in Latin, understood by scarcely any of your people, but you also endeavor to wrap them in even greater obscurity, by this and other prayers being repeated by the priest

alone, and that to himself, in order to mystify the matter, and to fill you with greater awe? Your church has taught you that, by virtue of these words of consecration, the bread has become the body, and the wine the blood of our Lord. Even in this, namely, the form and words of consecration, your church differs from the ancient church. St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, who lived in the fourth century, says, as quoted by Dupin, 1 vol., page 222—that “the bread and the wine of the Eucharist, before the invocation of the adorable Trinity, is but common bread and wine; but prayer being ended, the bread is the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ.” We pass over how he explains his meaning of this expression, which is very different indeed from your doctrine of transubstantiation, as it would lead us from our present purpose. Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome in the sixth and part of the seventh century, says:—“The reason we say the Lord’s Prayer immediately after the prayer of consecration, (or canon,) is, because the apostles were wont to consecrate the host of the oblation by that prayer only.” Where, then, we inquire, is your authority for persuading the people that, by pronouncing these secret words, this mighty change takes place? And does it not appear strange that your own writers differ among themselves as to what constitutes the consecrating power?—and the more ancient these writers are, the more they differ from your present practices!

Even admitting, for argument sake, that the bread does become the body, and the wine the blood of our Lord—by what authority do you say that both body and blood are included under either species, by what your church calls the doctrine of “concomitance,” a phrase totally unknown in the primitive ages, and which your own forms in the Mass entirely refute? Now see in what a position you are placed by your church, by her departure from scriptural truth. In the most unwarrantable manner, you shut up the words of our Lord in an unknown language, and in that language the Redeemer invites his faithful followers to partake of his

supper, and your church prevents them from hearing or understanding the invitation.

In the Primitive Church, no persons were permitted to be present at the celebration of the Eucharist unless they partook of the sacred elements. The tenth canon of those which are known by the title of the apostolic canons, is express upon this point, and says, "that those persons who assemble at the church to attend at the sacred ordinances, should listen to the writings of the apostles, the sacred Scriptures, and the Gospel; but those who do not remain in prayer until the Mass is finished, or who do not partake of the Holy Communion, it is right that they should be deprived of communion," that is, should be excommunicated. In the second canon of the third council held at Antioch, in the fourth century, we have severe ecclesiastical censures denounced against those who were present at the prayers and did not partake of the Holy Communion. The very words of our blessed Lord used in the Mass condemn your practice; he says:—"Take, eat, and drink ye *all* of this," a command which *all* you that are present do not comply with. What are called *solitary* Masses, which your priests frequently celebrate, where the people present do not communicate, were utterly unknown in the Primitive Church. It remained for your Roman Church to introduce such novelties as entirely changed the nature of the institution, and to mock you by an invitation to a feast, of which no person is allowed to partake but the priest.

After the consecration, he adores the consecrated elements, and elevates them in the sight of the people, who also adore. This practice was utterly unknown in the Primitive Church. Our blessed Lord says, "Take and eat." You depart from this by the command of your church; you neither take it nor eat it, but you fall down and worship it. In like manner, with respect to the consecrated wine, your church tells you it is changed into the blood of our Lord, and our Lord tells you *all* to drink of it—a direction he does not give respecting the bread, notwithstanding the wickedness of your infallible

church in inserting that word in reference to the bread, as we have before shown,—as if, in his infinite wisdom, he foresaw the anti-scriptural practices of your church, and wished to guard you against them by his own authority, and thus the precept of our Lord, as recorded by his apostles, and the practice of your church, are in complete opposition one to the other.

Our Lord's command, for all to drink the chalice, or wine, you give in the consecration prayer; so that out of her own mouth your church is condemned. How can you justify your departure from Scripture in this instance? Your church admits it was the primitive practice, but the reasons she brings forward to justify her change are really unworthy of comment. Our Lord commanded both to be given: he commanded his apostles to teach all nations to observe what he had commanded, Matt. xxviii. You assert, under one kind both the body and blood are taken. Where is this taught? Admitting that the bread is the body, and the wine the blood, how do you show that both are the same, as, if your church teaches correctly, must be the case?—but it is evident the Primitive Church understood it in no such sense; for then *the words of the consecration of both species would be the same*; but the words with you are different, using very properly those of our Lord, and with the grossest inconsistence making no difference between the two species which are called by different names.

In order to defend communion in one kind you refer to several passages in the Gospels, where you say the Eucharist is spoken of in the expression of "breaking of bread." We could easily show you that such expressions do not refer to the Eucharist at all; but still, according to your newly-invented doctrine of "concomitance," receiving in one hand would be *impossible*, as the body and blood always go together, and receiving *both species* would be only taking the same thing *twice over*. Thus, all your arguments to show the sufficiency of one species fall to the ground.

Perhaps there is no one departure of your Church from the pure doctrines of the gospel more plainly

against the express command of our Lord. Men were to be instructed, as he said, Matt. xxvii. 20, to do as he taught. Now the Council of Constance, held in the fifteenth century, the first of your infallible councils which summoned up sufficient courage expressly to contradict our Lord's direct command, admits "that Christ did institute this sacrament in both kinds, and that the faithful in the Primitive Church did receive in both kinds." Gelatius, Bishop of Rome, in the fifth century, spoke in the strongest language against the Manichees, (ancient heretics,) who would only take the bread and rejected the wine. His expression was that "such was a dividing of one and the same mystery or sacrament, which cannot be done without sacrilege."

It would be impossible, within a short compass, to quote the opinions of the ancient fathers of the Church, and the decrees of various councils testifying to the same truth. Your present practice followed, as a necessary consequence, from the doctrine of transubstantiation; and your Church, in order to work out consistently that false and absurd novelty, has been compelled to disobey the positive, the plain, and express command of our Lord, and to violate the uniform practice of the ancient Church for more than one thousand years. Be assured of this, however highly you are instructed to value yourselves upon your orthodoxy, had your Church, with its present doctrines, existed in the early ages, she would have been considered by the primitive fathers as one of those heretical churches of the most dangerous and wicked description, and as most opposed to the pure light of gospel truth, and every exertion would have been made to convince her of, and to free her from, her heresy.

In part of this prayer of consecration, we have a remarkable illustration of the truth of some of our preceding observations. We stated that, at the holy communion, it was the custom of the primitive Christians to bring offerings or oblations for the support of the Church; out of these which were offered to God, were taken the bread and wine for the celebration of the

Eucharist, and this was the offering or oblation mentioned sometimes by the early fathers.

You say, "Wherefore, O Lord, we, thy servants, offer unto thy Most Excellent Majesty, of thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure host, an holy host, an immaculate host; the blessed bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation." Here we find traces of ancient doctrine, though miserably corrupted. Both the elements are called the host or victim, but still the one is called the bread, and the other the chalice, or cup of eternal life. Surely, when this prayer was composed, at least the ancient part of it, the doctrine of the bread and the wine after consecration being *virtually the same*, or two bodies and two bloods, could never have been entertained in the Church—nor could the early Christians ever have believed that they, when spoken of in this manner, had become the *very body* and the *very blood* of our blessed Lord, and therefore to be worshipped.

We come next to remark upon the prayer used after consecration, which we gave before, where you call upon God to look upon what is offered to him with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them as the gift of Abel was accepted, and the sacrifice of Abraham, and what the high priest, Melchisedech, offered, a holy sacrifice, an unspotted host or victim. What is the meaning of this prayer? Upon your own principles you are taught to believe that the oblation you present is the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and you call upon God to look upon them with a serene and propitious countenance. Surely you must forget your own belief in other points. Surely God has accepted them—surely God has looked with favor upon his Son Jesus, and raised him from the dead; and that same body and blood is now at the right hand of God, united with the divinity of Jesus, to make intercession for us. You call upon God to accept them as he accepted Abel's offerings or Abraham's sacrifice, presumptuously comparing them to the offering made by Jesus upon the cross. Why were these sacrifices

accepted, as sin-offerings, but because there was a victim slain? Abel's was the firstling of his flocks; and we also read of the bloody sacrifice made by Abraham, Gen. xxii. 13, of the ram, instead of his son Isaac: all which had no merit in themselves, but only as they were typical of that one great sacrifice made by Jesus upon the cross.

You also allude to the holy sacrifice, the unspotted host of Melchisedech. Where did your infallible Church discover that Melchisedech ever offered a holy sacrifice, an unspotted host to God? Look to your own Bible,—and, blessed be God, you can, in these free countries, do so with impunity—open it at Gen. xiv. 18. Abraham, we are told in the preceding verses, was returning home, after having defeated and slain those kings who had taken his nephew Lot captive, and all his possessions. But Melchisedech, King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him and said—“Blessed be Abraham, by the Most High God, who created heaven and earth, and blessed be the Most High God, by whose protection your enemies are in your hands. And he (Abraham) gave him tithes of all he had taken.” There is no further mention of the matter. Where then is the holy sacrifice, the unspotted host, which your Church profanely says Melchisedech offered to God? The high priest brought out bread and wine to Abraham, and his men, wherewith to refresh themselves. What is there here to countenance the notion of sacrifice? Your translation and the Protestant translation of this passage are not the same. I give you all the benefit of your own translation, however erroneous we believe it to be.

I will now show you, upon the authority of St. Paul, what the true meaning of that expression is, of our Lord “being a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech.” You can refer to the seventh chapter of Hebrews, where he is describing the superior excellence of the priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the Jewish priesthood. Is it not then most remarkable,

that in describing the priesthood of Melchisedech, he should omit *that very particular* in which the Roman Catholic Church asserts his priesthood to consist ? He enumerates every particular related by Moses in Genesis, respecting him, with the *exception of his bringing forth bread and wine*; and why does he omit this, but because the apostle considered it constituted no part of his *priestly office*, but did of his *kingly office*? an allusion to which was not at all to the purpose that St. Paul had in view. It was the custom for nations and kings, as we read in Scripture, and elsewhere, to supply the armies of their friends with provisions as they passed in their neighborhood, Deut. ii. 28, 29; xxiii. 4; Judges viii. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xvii. 27. The priestly acts of Melchisedech are mentioned expressly by the apostle, namely, his blessing Abraham, and his receiving from him tenths or tithes. How was he then likened unto the Son of God ? The apostle tells us, verse 3, “because he was without father, without mother, without genealogy ; having neither beginning of days, nor end of life.” Now see the apostle’s argument. He wished, as we before observed, to show the superior excellency of our Lord’s priesthood, to that of the Jewish. Melchisedech was the priest of the Most High God ; and we find him exercising this office, as the apostle states, by receiving tithes from Abraham, and blessing him. The father and mother of Melchisedech are not known ; his genealogy or descent is not recorded, rather is *purposely omitted*, by the direction of the Holy Spirit, by whom Moses was guided in his writings ; his birth or his death is not ascertained—who his predecessor in the priesthood was, or who his successor, is not known. Consequently the Jews could not argue against our Lord’s priesthood, because he was not of the family of Levi, but descended from the tribe of Judah ; for we find Abraham, the ancestor of Levi, receiving a blessing from Melchisedech, and paying him tithes—thus acknowledging his superiority ; as the apostle St. Paul expresses it, verse 7—“And without all contradiction, that which is less is blessed by the greater.”

But even supposing that Melchisedech offered bread and wine to God, (which we know he did not,) and not to Abraham, surely your church has no warrant for her most extraordinary and most unmeaning prayer. In what sense can the bread and wine, unconsecrated, as brought forth by Melchisedech, be called "a holy sacrifice," an "unspotted host or victim?" If it were offered to God, it was offered as a free-will offering, as before stated, and in the same manner, and with the same intention, as we have already shown, that the primitive Christians offered their oblations, and that bread and wine which were afterwards consecrated for the purpose of the Eucharist.

Surely you must admit that this is a gross perversion of the sacred Scriptures. When the ancient church offered up to God the bread and wine, the fruits of the earth intended for the Eucharist, they had no idea of their being offered up in any other sense than as a free-will offering unto the Lord. St. Paul places this matter beyond all doubt, in the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he is contrasting the Jewish sacrifices with the one sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, which they typified. He says, v. 22, "But he, (Jesus,) offering one sacrifice for sins, forever sitteth at the right hand of God." How absurd to say, in opposition to this assertion, that his body and blood are on the altar, and that you are bound to worship them there, "For, v. 14, by one oblation he hath *perfected* forever them that are sanctified;" and the Holy Ghost also doth testify to us—"And this is the covenant which I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will give my laws to their hearts, and on their minds will I write them, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." "Now," adds the apostle, "where there is a remission of these, *there is no more an oblation for sin.*" And yet you call yourselves an Apostolic Church, say there is a further oblation for sin, and thus contradict an inspired apostle—one expressly instructed by the Holy Ghost! And this conclusion is very plain; for if all sins and iniqui-

ties are not remembered by God against those who are sanctified by the Holy Ghost through the one sacrifice, which is a perfect and finished one, as the apostle tells us immediately after—if that one sacrifice made by Jesus upon the cross, “exhausted,” as you translate it, Heb. ix. 28, “the sins of many,” what further need is there for any other offering, when the one is sufficient? Besides, St. Paul tells you plainly, that even upon your own grounds it cannot be an offering for the remission of sin, which your church, as she tells you, makes of the Saviour in an *unbloody manner*; for he tells you as plainly as words can express it, “that without *shedding of blood* there is no remission.” By the phrase “*shedding of blood*,” is implied the slaying of the victim.

Even the term “consecration,” which is used in your Mass to express the change which takes place in the elements, shows what the view of the Primitive Church was. “Consecrate” means to dedicate to sacred purposes, and this is what the ancient church did. Why not call it the prayer of “Transubstantiation?” Such would certainly be a more appropriate title, and suit much better with your new doctrines. Thus, you see into what absurdities, into what anti-scriptural tenets, your church has fallen, when she once left the pure light of Scripture, and by wicked inventions sought to raise herself in the estimation of her ignorant followers.

Another practice your priests have at the Mass, which, upon your own grounds, is more than absurd, the signing with the sign of the cross the consecrated elements. This, upon the principles of your church, that they have become the body and blood, with the soul and divinity of our blessed Lord, is an exhibition of presumptuous ignorance and inconsistence utterly unaccountable, unless upon the supposition that your church practised it *before* she taught you to believe that the elements had become the body and blood of our Lord. Could any thing your priests do make Jesus more holy, more pure? While he walked upon earth, could his apostles have made him so? And still your

church pretends she has such power. One of your pretended reasons for making the sign of the cross is, to keep off the powers of darkness, and here you pretend to fright away the evil spirits from that which you are taught to believe is the body and blood of our Lord. Away with such blasphemous presumption!

You pray that these oblations, which have become, according to your church, the body and blood of our Lord, may be carried by the hands of a blessed angel to God's high altar. What authority have you from God's word to sanction any such petition? You acknowledge that Jesus is now at the right hand of God, having made his sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, which sacrifice God has accepted. He is now at the right hand of God making intercession for his faithful people; still, although you admit all this to be true, you, in addition, invent a new doctrine. You teach that your church has power to form a similar body to that now at God's right hand, and you employ an angel to carry it to heaven, and upon an altar of genuine Roman anti-scriptural construction, to offer him afresh, as if his first sacrifice were insufficient, and his present intercession unavailing. Surely it was Jesus *offered himself*. No created being, angel or man, could make such an offering or sacrifice.

But at the conclusion of that prayer we find traces of the ancient pure doctrine; for you supplicate that as many as partake of the body and blood, (and here the priest makes the sign of the cross over the host and the chalice, plainly implying that one *is*, as you teach—and *represents*, as we believe—the body, and the chalice the blood,) should be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace. Surely that part of the prayer was composed when both were given to the people; and the inference follows, that they were not to be filled with these spiritual blessings unless they partook of both the bread and the wine. Your church, brethren, has fallen into awful error upon this point: the first and fundamental error of transubstantiation drew after it several others. Do not imagine that this doctrine was

not opposed when it was first introduced. We find many evidences that it was, most fiercely and vehemently ; we have thus irresistible proofs to show that such a doctrine was not received or submitted to quietly in the early ages of the church.

You have heard of the Arian heresy which prevailed in the fourth century after our Lord, the supporters of which attacked his divinity, denied him to be God, and said he was only a superior angel. This controversy was kept up for many years. The Arian side was supported by many bishops, even by some of the bishops of Rome, heads of your infallible church ; and yet your doctrine was never attacked ; and surely if the divinity of our Lord were attacked, the consequences of that divinity must have been attacked, namely—transubstantiation. And again, in all the apologies and defences for Christianity published in the early ages by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, &c., &c., in which we find many strange and wicked charges brought forward by the enemies of the Christian faith, among whom was Julian the apostate, a crafty and subtle opponent, we do not discover any charge connected with this subject ; a conclusive evidence that no such doctrine was entertained in the church at that period ; for surely had it *been then taught it would have been fiercely attacked.* All the ancient liturgies bear testimony to the correctness of our views ; and the frequent use of the words “type,” “antitype,” “sign,” and “mystery,” as applied to the bread and wine with reference to the body and blood of our Lord, show clearly what the Primitive Church inculcated.

The first writer who brought forward the doctrine of transubstantiation was Paschasius Radbert, monk of Corby, who lived in the eighth century ; he is acknowledged by Bellarmin and Sirmandus—two eminent Roman Catholic divines—to be the first writer who specially advanced and explained this doctrine. He was opposed by several most eminent men ; by Johannes Scotus Erigena, the Irishman, (yes, *an Irishman* opposed the novel doctrine of transubstantiation when

first introduced,) Bertram of Ratram, &c., &c., all of whose doctrines agree with the reformed church. Berengarius, in the eleventh century, also opposed it; but the age of darkness had set in upon the church—he was condemned by several succeeding councils. The expression or term, “transubstantiation,” was unknown in the ancient church. Manning, a celebrated Roman Catholic writer, in his “Shortest Way to End Disputes,” page 134, admits that it was first used at the fourth Lateran Council, more than one thousand years after the institution of the Last Supper; and it is truly remarkable, that at the period of the grossest darkness and ignorance in Europe—when few knew how to read—before the art of printing had been discovered—those corrupt and monstrous doctrines were forced upon the poor, ignorant, and defenceless people, by which the power of the Roman Church was extended, and kings and nations grievously oppressed; and this we find foretold in the Book of Revelation, xiii.

Still this tyranny did not entirely suppress the opposition, which the false doctrines of the Church of Rome received. The Waldenses and the Albigenses proclaimed their detestation of those novel principles which were then endeavored to be forced upon the church; and for doing so, encountered the unmitigated persecution of the church of Rome. The sword and the fagot were used, and every effort was made to exterminate all opposers of the Roman heresy; and it is stated that upwards of one million of those whom you call heretics, were destroyed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, though your teachers would persuade you, that your false and usurping church received no opposition before Luther.

We find Wickliff, in England, protesting against the errors of your church in the 14th century; and John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, sealed with their blood the sincerity of their belief, at the stake to which they were condemned by the Council of Constance, held in the 15th century, which set at naught the oath of safety which they had obtained from the emperor, Sigismund,

if they would attend the council, and from which this wicked council thought fit to release him, upon the principle *that no faith was to be kept with heretics.*

You know how Luther recommenced the attack,\* it was only *recommencing it.* The art of printing had been discovered; and by the printing and circulation of the Holy Scriptures, the revealed Word of God, the opposers of Rome's usurpation had multiplied to such an extent, that the old and frequently successfully tried system of extermination by fire and sword was unavailing, and Protestants (so called from *protesting* against the innovations and errors of popery) were enabled, with the Divine assistance, to withstand their persecutors. And the more extensively God's word is spread, and is looked upon as the pillar and ground of Divine truth, so much the more will Protestantism prevail, because it takes for its foundation and rule, that sacred volume which is so much opposed to the Roman doctrines which have been latterly introduced, and because it is "able to make us wise, or instructed, in the way of salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus."

Our Blessed Lord himself has given us warning upon this subject; he, in the exercise of his Divine wisdom, foresaw the gross abuses which would prevail in the church upon this subject. In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, we have a most important caution from our Lord himself—we read, v. 23, "then if any man shall say unto you: Lo, here is Christ, or there, do not believe him—for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive, if it be possible, even the elect. Behold I have told it to you beforehand. If, therefore,

\* Three circumstances, humanly speaking, greatly favored the Reformation at the time of Luther. 1.—The discovery of the art of printing, by which copies of the Holy Scriptures were placed in the hands of multitudes who before could not procure them. 2.—The taking of Constantinople by the Turks a short time previous, by which many learned men, who differed from the Roman faith, were driven into those countries under the Pope's dominion. And 3.—The flagrant violation of all decency, by Tetzel, in the sale of Indulgences, for which he obtained a commission from the Pope.

they (those false prophets or teachers) say : Behold, he is in the desert, go ye not out. Behold, he (that is, Christ) is in the closets, believe it not." Now bring your doctrine of transubstantiation to the test of this passage. Your church says, Christ is here in the priest's hands—fall down and worship him: our Lord tells you to believe no such assertion. Your church teaches you that her truth and power were confirmed by many miracles, and our Lord Jesus Christ tells you *on that very account*, you should be more upon your guard against her teaching, for it is by such means, namely, by great signs and wonders men will be deceived. Your church tells you that the Lord Jesus Christ is locked up in a little box or tabernacle, or pyx; and Jesus himself tells you not to credit any such assertion. The word translated "closets," may be more properly rendered by the term "cupboard," which accurately applies to what the host is preserved in. Jesus himself tells you not to believe this—your church tells you that you must; which are you to listen to? More than one of the apostles have recorded this warning of our Lord.

Jesus instituted his Last Supper, and desired his servants to do the same, in commemoration or remembrance of him; if he were to be present, *bodily*, in the sacrament, such a reason for celebrating the Eucharist would be unintelligible, as we cannot commemorate one who is present. When the early Christians *commemorated* the martyrs and saints, to which we referred before, surely it was upon the supposition of their absence in glory, in order to be excited to imitate their holiness and constancy in the faith; their living bodily presence was never contemplated. When the *same expression* in the original is used with reference to our Blessed Lord, why should so different a meaning be given, and why should you be taught that he is *present, bodily*, in the Eucharist, when the very phrase clearly implies his absence; as we are never said to do any thing in *remembrance* of one who is present with us, and be-

fore our eyes,\* as you say the Lord Jesus is in the wafer?

Jesus tells us, Matt. xxviii. 20, "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." And in chap. xxvi. 11, we find him saying—"Me ye have not always." How are you to reconcile this apparent contradiction, except that in one place he speaks of his body, which is ever at the right hand of God, and in the other of his Spirit, by which he watches over, and listens to the supplications, and supplies the wants of the faithful members of his church. But hear what our Lord Jesus Christ says, Matt. xv. 13, 14—"Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up ;" which means, that every doctrine attempted to be established by men, without the authority of God, will ultimately be destroyed. Teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, is only vain worship, Matt. xv. 9 ; such a system in vain seeks the favor of God : to be acceptable to him, it must be reformed by the light of his own word. And in the next verse, our Lord says of such as teach and support any uns scriptural tenets, unsanctioned by him—"Let them alone, they are blind, and leaders of the blind ; and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit." You see, from this passage, that your following the false teaching of your church, is no justification for your falling into error. God has given you his word to give you light in your course ; and if you turn away from the teaching of Christ himself, and of his holy apostles, and follow after blind guides who tell you that they can teach you plainer than our Lord and his inspired evangelists, and independently of his written word,—which those wil-

\* The argument used by Romanists against this view, from the text, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," Eccl. xii. 1, that we are desired here to remember God, though he is present, proves nothing in their favor. If we could see God with our eyes, the case would be different. But as "no man hath seen God at any time," John, i. 18, we are apt to forget his spiritual presence everywhere ; and therefore we are called upon to *remember him*, that is, that his Spirit is present with us and about our path and about our bed, spieth out all our ways, Psalm cxxxix. 2. This passage strongly supports, not your views, but those of Protestants.

fully blind guides say you cannot understand, and must therefore take upon trust from those very persons whose interest it is to deceive you,—what else can you expect but to fall into error and heresy, *hateful to God, and destructive of your eternal interests?*

R.—*Commemoratio pro functis.*

T.—*Commemoration for the dead.*

*Memento etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuorum, N. et N. qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis.*

T.—Remember also, O Lord, thy menservants and handmaidens who have gone before us with the sign of the faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace.

R.—*Jungit manus, orat aliquantulum pro iis defunctis, pro quibus orare intendit, deinde extensis manibus prose-quitur.*

T.—He joins his hands, and prays for a short time for those dead persons for whom he intends to pray ; then with extended hands he proceeds—

*Ipsis, Domine, et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum refrigerii, lucis, et pacis, ut indulgeas deprecamur, (jungit manus et caput inclinat.) Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.*

T.—To them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, we pray that thou mayest grant a place of refreshment, light, and peace, (he joins his hands and bows his head,) through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

We admit this to be an ancient prayer ; and our reason for doing so is, that although it sanctions prayers for the dead, an early heresy, which we before showed received no support from our Lord or his holy apostles ; still it proves to us, what we have repeatedly remarked in the preceding pages, that the errors of your church were introduced *successively*. For whom do you pray here ? You answer, for those who have departed or died with the sign of the faith, and *sleep the sleep of peace*. Where are such—are they in purgatory ? How can they be undergoing a process of purifying *punishment*,

and, at the same time, *sleeping the sleep of peace?* Those that die in the Lord, in the faith of Jesus, rest from their labors, as St. John tells us, Rev. xiv. 13, upon the authority of a voice from heaven, to which we before referred. Can any thing be more absurd than your doctrine? If they die in the Lord, they rest from their labors. You only pray for those who die in the faith of the Lord Jesus; and though you acknowledge they sleep in peace, still you pray that they may obtain that which you admit they already enjoy. Where is purgatory taught here?—quite the contrary.

Again, we find a plain proof of what I stated before, that your church began to pray *for* the departed saints before you were taught to pray *to* them; and Milner, in his “End of Religious Controversy,” unintentionally bears his testimony to the truth of this assertion. In the note on the article “Apostolicity,” he is giving a sort of epitome of the history of the church, and of the errors of those whom he calls heretics. In the fourth century, he speaks of “the Arians who impugned, or opposed, prayers *for* the dead.” And in the fifth century, he speaks of Vigilantius, “who scoffed at the celibacy of the clergy, prayers *to* the saints, and veneration for their relics.” Thus admitting indirectly that praying *for*, preceded praying *to* the saints, the one being attacked before the other. You pray not only for “ipsis N. et N.,” that is, for those who are individually named, but also for “omnibus in Christe quiescentibus,” for *all who rest or sleep in Christ*, that they may obtain a place of refreshment, light, and peace. Now, my Roman Catholic brethren, do the saints rest in Christ Jesus? Does the blessed Virgin rest in Christ Jesus? If you believe they do, your church teaches you to pray *for* them; and how utterly inconsistently, how absurdly are you instructed to pray *for* the saints and *to* the saints in the same service. I leave it to your infallible church to reconcile this difficulty; and certainly it requires a strong confidence in such infallibility, to believe in assertions and doctrines so entirely at variance with each other.

R.—Manu dextera percutit sibi pectus, elata parum voce dicens.

T.—He strikes his breast with his right hand, and with his voice a little raised, says—

Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis, de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus, partem et aliquam et societatem donare digneris cum tuis sanctis apostolis et martyribus ; cum Joanne, Stephano, Matthia, Barnaba, Ignatio, Alexandro, Marcellino, Petro, Felicitate, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agneta, Cæcilia, Anastatia, et omnibus sanctis tuis ; intra quorum nos consortium, non æstimator meriti, sed veniae quæsumus largitor, admitte, (jungit manus.) Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—To us, also, sinners, thy servants, confiding in the multitude of thy mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with thy holy apostles and martyrs ; with John, Stephen, Mathias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitatis, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cæcilia, Anastasia, and all the saints ; into whose company we beseech thee to admit us, not in consideration of any of our merits, but the bestower of pardon on our offences ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, semper bona creas, (signat ter super hostiam et calicem simul dicens,) sancti  $\text{X}$  ficas, vivi  $\text{X}$  ficas, bene  $\text{X}$  dicas, et præstas nobis, (discooperit calicem genuflectit, accepit sacramentum dextera, tenens sinistra calicem, signat cum hostia ter a labia ad labrum calicis, dicens,) Per ipsum, et cum ip  $\text{X}$  so, et in ip  $\text{X}$  so, (bis signat inter calicem et pectus,) est tibi Deo patri  $\text{X}$  omnipotenti, in unitate Spiritus  $\text{X}$  Sancti, (elevans parum calicem cum hostia dicit,) omnis honor et gloria, (reponit hostiam, cooperit calicem, genuflectit surgit et dicit,) per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

T.—By whom, O Lord, thou dost always create all these good things, (he makes the sign of the cross three times over the host and the chalice, saying at the same time,)—Sanctify,  $\text{X}$  enliven,  $\text{X}$  bless,  $\text{X}$  and afford us all of them, (he then uncovers the chalice, kneels down,

takes the sacrament in his right hand, holding the chalice in his left, he makes the sign of the cross three times from edge to edge of the chalice, saying,)—by  $\ddagger$  whom, and with  $\ddagger$  whom, and in  $\ddagger$  whom, (he makes the sign of the cross twice between the chalice and his breast,) there is to thee, God, the Father  $\ddagger$  Almighty, in the unity of the Holy  $\ddagger$  Ghost, (raising the chalice a little with the host, he says,)—all honor and glory, (he lays down the host, he covers the chalice, kneels down, rises up, and says,)—for ever and ever. Res.—Amen.

We have, in this prayer, another remarkable instance of the gross inconsistency of some of the prayers in your Mass, with your professed doctrines; and also with each other. You call upon God to admit you into the fellowship of the blessed saints and apostles and martyrs—and on what do you ground your claim of such a blessing? Is it on account of your own merits, or the merits of those apostles, saints, and martyrs? No, you disclaim most properly all such merit; and you beseech for pardon through his merits, who alone possesses any in the sight of God, namely, Jesus Christ, our Lord. We would here inquire, is it not sufficient for you to supplicate to enjoy the fellowship of the holy apostles and saints, and martyrs as a body, but you must needs also introduce a number of names of persons of whom you know nothing? They may be good or bad, for aught you know to the contrary; and I cannot discover by what authority your church, or any church, has to pronounce, or declare, dogmatically, that any individual is in glory. “Judge not before the time,” St. Paul says, 1 Cor. iv. 5, “until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will manifest the counsels of the hearts—and then shall every man have praise of God.” We may *believe*, that our friends who have departed in the faith of Jesus, are in peace, and heirs of glory. But that is quite another matter from the right which your church has usurped of “canonizing,” as she terms it, any persons she assumes are deserving of such an honor; several of her canonized

saints have been of very questionable characters; and of supposing that the pope's decree alone is sufficient to warrant the title of saint being prefixed to their names.

Your church assumes for her popes the power of granting admission to Christ's glorious kingdom to those he approves of; but our Lord himself tells you he has delegated that power to no person. "I am," said our Lord, "the first and the last, and am alive, and was dead; and behold I am living forever and ever, and have the keys of death and of hell," Rev. i. 17, 18. He here says he retains them in his own possession. He gave St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven—that is, the privilege, as we before stated, of preaching the Gospel, the entrance to Christ's church upon earth, first to Jews and Gentiles; but of *death or hell*, of man's future state after this life, he reserves all in his own power. And in the third chapter, v. 7, Rev., we read thus:—"Saith the Holy One, and the true One: he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and *no man* shutteth, shutteth and *no man* openeth." Can any declaration be plainer to show that your popes have usurped a power which Jesus, the great shepherd of souls, reserves to himself, and communicates to *no man*—mark the expression "*man*" in the above passage. "The words," saith our Lord, "which I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day," John xii. 48. How can your church answer this?

The concluding part of this prayer is only remarkable for the numerous crossings and genuflexions used; but when your church appointed all these crossings and blessings of the consecrated host and chalice, she never could have believed them to be the very body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus, as requiring any of these forms you call means of grace or blessings. Thus an unobjectionable prayer is corrupted by these unscriptural and absurd forms, opposed by common sense to your own professed principles.

R.—Jungit manus. Oremus.

T.—He joins his hands together, and says—Let us pray:

Præceptis salutaribus moniti, et divinæ institutione formati, audemus (extendet manus) dicere.

T.—Instructed by wholesome precepts, and taught by divine appointment, we presume (he extends his hands) to say—

Pater noster, qui es in cœlis, sanctificetur nomen tuum, adveniat regnum tuum, fiat voluntas tua, sicut in cœlo et in terra ; panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie, et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris ; et ne nos inducas in tentationem. R. Sed libera nos a malo. P. Amen.

T.—Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done as in heaven, so in earth. Give us this day our daily bread ; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation. Response.—But deliver us from evil.

R.—Sacerdos secrete dicit—Amen.

T.—The priest secretly says—Amen.

Mark the simplicity and clearness of this prayer, taught by our Lord Jesus Christ to his disciples. In this prayer we find no address to angels for their intercession, or *to* or *for* departed souls of the faithful. No crossings, or other superstitious practices. We are thus instructed to go at once to God, the Father of Jesus, our Saviour, and thus the reconciled Father and parent of all who trust in him.

R.—Deinde accipit patenam inter indicem et medium digitos et dicit.

T.—He then takes the paten between his fore and middle fingers, and says—

Libera nos, quæsumus, Domine, ab omnibus malis præteritis, præsentibus, et futuris, et intercedente beata et gloria semper virgine, Dei genitrice Maria, cum beatis apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo, atque Andrea, et omnibus sanctis, (signat se cum patena a fronte ad pectus eam osculatur,) da propitius pacem in diebus nostris, ut ope misericordiae tuæ adjuti, et a peccato simus sem-

per liberi et ab omni perturbatione securi, (*submittit patenam hostiæ discooperit calicem genuflectit surgit, accipit hostiam, frangit eam super calicem per medium dicens.*) Per eundem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium tuum, (*partem quæ in dextera est ponit super patenam, deinde ex parte, quæ in sinistra remansit, frangit particulum dicens,*) qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus, (*aliam medium partem cum ipsa sinistra ponit super patenam, et dextera, tenens particulam super calice, sinistra calicem dicit,*) per omnia sæcula sæculorum. R.—Amen.

T.—Deliver us, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come; and by the intercession of the blessed and glorious Mary, ever a Virgin, the Mother of God, and by that of thy blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and Andrew, and all the saints, (*he here makes the sign of the cross with the paten from his forehead to his breast, and kisses it,*) mercifully grant us peace in our days, that being assisted by the help of thy compassion, we may be always free from sin, and secure from all trouble, (*he places the paten under the host, he uncovers the chalice, kneels down, rises up, takes the host, breaks it over the chalice in the middle, saying,*) through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son, (*he places the part which is in his right hand upon the paten, then of that which remains in his left he breaks off a small piece, saying,*) who liveth and reigneth with thee, O God, in the unity of the Spirit, (*the other half he places with his left hand upon the paten, and holding with his right the small piece over the chalice, and holding the chalice in his left hand, says,*) for ever and ever. (Answer) Amen.

This prayer assumes a new feature respecting the intercession of saints; hitherto you have been only addressing the saints, to plead for you with God. You have been claiming pardon through their merits; both which practices, we trust, we have fully shown to be unwarranted by the word of God, and contrary to primitive usage. But here your Church introduces a variety in the system; and you are instructed to call upon

God to grant your petition, for deliverance from all evils, past, present, and future, which includes every possible case, by the intercession of the Virgin, and the Apostles and the saints. What has become, brethren, of the office of Jesus? You have acknowledged him to be your intercessor, and here you seem to forget such to be the case; and your Church blasphemously introduces others, his servants, into that very office, to fulfil which was one of the purposes for which he came into the world. Can you possibly suppose that God will listen with favor to such a prayer? From one end to the other of Holy Scripture you will search in vain for a precedent—antiquity has nothing like it. But it has remained for your Church to address the King of kings, and Lord of lords, in language totally opposed to that Gospel, which declares, in the passage quoted before, “that there is only one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,” 1 Tim. ii. 5. You have been acknowledging in the prayer just preceding, that the Lord Jesus Christ was he, through whom God gives us all things; and here you introduce a petition as if what you had before stated, you did not believe, but required additional intercessors to plead your cause with God; although Jesus himself has told you that “whatsoever you ask the Father in his name, that,” he says, “I will do; that the Father may be glorified in the Son,” John xiv. 13—not in those intercessors whom your Church so vainly puts forward. Can any thing be more condemnatory of your practice? And then again at the conclusion, you say—through Jesus Christ, our Lord, that this is to be done. What is the meaning of this? How is it to be reconciled with what goes before? If you profess to believe that Jesus is to intercede, why, unless you think him to be insufficient, make use of the others?

While this prayer is saying, your priest is doing what seems most strange upon Roman Catholic principles. He takes up the host and breaks it in the middle over the chalice, and then he breaks off a piece from that in his left hand; and thus the host is divided into

three pieces. Now, here again, your Church departs from what our Lord did, as you yourselves admit. Our Lord took the bread, and blessed and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take and eat of this, (all of you, as you falsely assert,) for this is my body." Here we find that he broke the bread *before* the consecration; but see what you do, after your Church has taught you to believe that it has become the *very* body of our Lord—and in consistence with that belief, has taught you to worship or adore it, your priest then takes it in his hands, that is, the body of our Lord, and breaks it into three pieces. Does each of these pieces become an entire body?—for, if so, the body of our Lord is not broken at all; and, therefore, you cannot do what our Lord did; or, if it is broken into pieces, how much of his body goes to one part, how much to another? You observe to what absurdities your Church leads you. It is plain that if each particle becomes the entire body, that you practise a most unmeaning form, as *it can never be broken*, for upon each division a new entire body is produced or formed. But the truth is, we have here another proof, that many of the forms and ceremonies of the Mass preceded certain doctrines which your Church now professes to enforce. The breaking of the host, or bread, certainly *preceded the belief* in the doctrine of transubstantiation; for you never could think of breaking the host into pieces—for by so doing, when you believe it to be the actual and *very* body of our Lord, you become involved in blasphemous absurdities, as we have shown above.

R.—Cum ipsa particula signat ter super calicem, dicens.

T.—With this very particle of the host he makes the sign of the cross over the chalice, saying—

Pax ✠ Domini, sit ✠ semper vobis ✠ cum. Res.—Et cum spiritu tuo.

T.—May the peace ✠ of the Lord be ✠ always with ✠ you. Res.—And with thy Spirit.

Here, again, is a strange inconsistency—the priest

holds a particle of the host in his hand ; this you have worshipped, as believing it to be the body and blood of our Lord, and of course, as we before remarked, this particle must be either the entire body of our Lord, or a part. This latter the word "particle," used in your rubric, would seem to imply ; and although you have professed to believe one or other of these two doctrines, still you take up the body of our Lord and make with it the sign of the cross over the chalice. Surely, when this ceremony was commanded, such a belief could not have existed. I cannot understand how you can *make the sign of the cross with the body of Jesus* ; it seems so utterly absurd—so openly profane, to prefer in one sense the sign to the thing signified, that I am at a loss in what terms to censure it. You must have unlimited confidence in your infallible Church, to believe that such a practice should be tolerated for a moment.

R.—Particulam ipsam, immittit in calicem dicens secrete.

T.—He casts the same particle into the chalice, saying, secretly—

Hæc commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fiat accipientibus nobis in vitam æternam. Amen.

T.—May this mingling together, and the consecration of the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, become, to us who receive them, profitable to eternal life.

Here you have another gross inconsistency between your doctrine and practice. We have already seen that your Church teaches that both body and blood are contained under either species ; and yet here, in opposition to that tenet, you mix them, you join and unite them, by putting the broken wafer or host into the wine. Now, surely, when your church commanded that mingling together to be used—the other doctrine could not have been entertained—she must have believed that the bread alone was the body, or represented the body—and the wine only was the blood, or represented the blood.

I really cannot understand what you are to call the mixed host and wine. What does it become? Is not the body and blood, in your view, *already united*? Exercise your own reason, and surely you must admit the lamentable confusion that is thus made in the most sacred matters.

R.—*Cooperit calicem, genuflectit surgit, et inclinatus sacramento junctis manibus et ter pectus pecutiens dicit*—Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis; Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis; Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, dona nobis pacem.

T.—He covers the chalice, he kneels down, rises up, and bowing towards the sacrament with joined hands, and striking his breast three times, says—Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, grant us peace.

Here again we must remark upon the multiplied forms used by your church. Do you not think that the prayer of your priest to the Saviour, if offered from a sincere heart, will be as efficacious without, as if accompanied by the form of beating his breast three times? We hear of no such instruction given in God's word, as to this accompaniment of prayer. However, we find your priest goes here at once to the Saviour. Why does he not practise this always? Why does your Church at one time teach the necessity of additional mediators and intercessors, and here address the Lord Jesus as if he were, as, in truth, he is, the only refuge for sinners? "The Lamb of God," as John the Baptist calls him, John i. 29, "who taketh away the sins of the world."

R.—In missis pro defunctis, non dicitur "Miserere nobis," sed ejus loco "dona eis requiem," et in tertio additur "sempiternam." Deinde junctis manibus super altare inclinatus dicit sequentes orationes.

T.—In Masses for the dead, "Have mercy upon us,"

is not said, but "give them (the dead) rest," in place of it; and the word "everlasting" is added in the third place. Then with joined hands and bending over the altar, he says the following prayers:—

R.—*Domine Jesu Christe, qui dixisti apostolis tuis, pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam do vobis, ne respicias peccata mea, sed fidem ecclesiæ tuæ, eamque secundum voluntatem tuam pacificare et coadunare digneris; qui vivis et regnas Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum.* Amen.

T.—O Lord Jesus Christ, who saidst unto thine apostles—peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, look not upon my sins, but upon the faith of thy church, and vouchsafe, according to thy will, to grant it peace and union—who livest and reignest, God, world without end. Amen.

When your Roman church is offering up this prayer, ought she not to have serious apprehensions as to the view which our Lord will take of those various novelties and inconsistencies which she has introduced into her public formularies, directly opposed to his own express words—by which the Christian world is now so sadly divided and distracted?

R.—*Si danda est pax, osculatur altare et dans pacem dicit.* Pax tecum. Res.—*Et cum spiritu tuo.*

T.—If the peace is to be given, he kisses the altar, and giving the peace, he says—Peace be with you.  
R.—And with thy spirit.

R.—*In missis defunctorum, non datur pax neque dicitur praecedens oratio.*

T.—In Masses for the dead, the peace is not given; neither is the preceding prayer said.

*Domine Jesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi, qui ex voluntate Patris, eo-operante Spiritu Sancto, per mortem tuam mundum vivificasti, libera me per hoc sacro-sanctum corpus et sanguinem tuum ab omnibus iniquitatibus meis et universis malis; et fac me tuis semper inhærente mandatis, et a te nunquam separari permittas; qui cum eo-*

dem Deo Patre, et Spiritu Sancto vivis et regnas, Deus, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

T.—O Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who, by the will of the Father, the Holy Spirit co-operating, through thy death hast given life unto the world—by this sacred body, and by thy blood, free me from all mine iniquities, and from all evils, and make me always to remain in thy commandments, and suffer me never to be separated from thee—who with the same God the Father, and the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest, God, world without end. Amen.

Is it not here most inconsistent for your priest to pray to our Lord to be kept always in obedience to his commandments, when he submits to the laws of his church, which, he must perceive and know, are in direct opposition to those commands?

*Perceptio corporis tui, Domine Jesu Christe, quod ego indignus sumere præsumo, non mihi proveniat in judicium et condemnationem; sed pro tua pietate proposit mihi ad tutamentum mentis et corporis, et ad medelam percipiendam; qui vivis et regnas cum Deo Patre, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, Deus, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.*

T.—Let not the participation of thy body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I unworthy presume to take, be turned to my judgment and condemnation; but, according to thy mercy, may it be profitable to the safety and healing of my mind and body—who livest and reignest with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

I must again direct your attention to the entire absence of any prayer to saints and angels for their intercession: your priest goes at once to the Lord Jesus. I must, however, remark upon the unmeaning petition which he offers up, that he may be freed from all iniquities and evils, by means of that consecrated host, and what you call the blood of our Lord. Why address such a petition? The body of Jesus, as we have seen from Scripture, is now at the right hand of God—that you

are sure of, and admit. Why not allude to that living Saviour who animates that body, and who is making intercession for his people? He tells you himself, John vi. 64, "it is the Spirit that quickeneth; *the flesh profiteth nothing.*" Even supposing that the bread and the wine were transubstantiated into the body and blood of our Lord—still it is by the living Saviour, risen from the dead, that you have access to God; and it is by him, and through him only, you are to approach the throne of grace, and be favorably received.

R.—Genuflectit surgit et dicit.

T.—He kneels down, rises up, and says—

Why does the priest here kneel down without saying any thing, and then rise up? Can any thing be more senseless and unmeaning?

Panem cœlestem accipiam, et nomen Domini invocabo.

T.—I will take the heavenly bread, and call upon the name of the Lord.

R.—Deinde parum inclinatus ambas partes hostiæ, inter pollicem et indicem sinistræ manus, et patenam inter eundem indicem et medium, et dextera percutiens pectus elevata aliquantulum voce, dicit ter devote et humiliter—Domine, non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum: sed tantum die verbo et sanabitur anima mea.

T.—Then bending down a little, he takes both parts of the host between the thumb and fore finger of his left hand, and the paten between the same fore finger and the middle finger; and striking his breast with his right hand, and raising his voice a little, he says three times with devotion and humility—Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under the roof of my house, but speak the word only, and my soul shall be healed.

R.—Postea dextera se signans cum hostia super patenam dicit.

T.—After this, signing himself with the sign of the cross with his right hand, and with the host upon the paten, he says—

Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam meam in vitam æternam. Amen.

T.—May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

R.—Sumit reverenter ambas partes hostiæ, jungit manus et quiescit aliquantulum in meditatione sanctissimi sacramenti. Deinde discooperit calicem, genuflectit colligit fragmenta, si quæ sint, extergit patenam, super calicem interim dicens.

T.—He takes with reverence both parts of the host, he joins his hands and remains quiet for a short time in meditation of the most blessed sacrament ; then he uncovers the chalice, kneels down, collects the fragments, if there are any, wipes the paten over the chalice, in the mean while saying—

We cannot refrain from inquiring here, what are those fragments which the priest gathers up ? Are they parts of the body of our Lord ? or are they, each of them, the entire body ? If so, in what an extraordinary position does this rubric place the doctrines of your church—the collecting a number of bodies of our Lord together. Be assured, when this rubric was appointed, the absurd and blasphemous tenets of transubstantiation were unknown. And a further proof that this doctrine was unknown when these prayers were introduced into the canon of the Mass, is evident from the priest calling the host “heavenly bread.” Now our blessed Lord says that “he is the bread that came down from heaven,” John vi. 33, 35 ; consequently, the heavenly bread cannot be his carnal body which he received of the blessed Virgin, but that spiritual food of which he speaks when he says—“he that cometh to me, shall not hunger ; and he that believeth in me, shall not thirst”—showing that it is by faith we are said to feed upon him. “My meat,” saith our Lord, John iv. 34, “is to do the will of him that sent me.” “Not by *bread alone*,” saith our Lord in another place, Matt. iv. 4, “doth man live, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” Another instance to show

how our Lord makes use of the expression of “drinking”—to describe the spiritual refreshment of the soul. We find, John iv. 13—“ he that shall drink of the water I shall give him, shall not thirst for ever.” Again, he says, Matt. v. 6—“ Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall have their fill.” These passages show how entirely your church misrepresents our blessed Lord’s meaning, when he speaks of eating and drinking ; and to what wretched absurdities and contradictions you are driven by the novel doctrine of transubstantiation, invented only to increase the power and authority of your Church.

*Quid retribuam Domino pro omnibus quæ retribuit mihi ? Calicem salutaris accipiam, et nomen Domini invocabo. Laudans invocabo Dominum, et ab inimicis meis salvus ero.*

T.—What return shall I make unto the Lord for all he has bestowed upon me ? I will receive the cup of salvation, and will call upon the name of the Lord. Praising him, I will invoke the Lord, and I will be safe from mine enemies.

R.—*Accipit calicem manu dextera et eo se signus dicit.*

T.—He takes the chalice in his right hand, and signing himself with it with the sign of the cross, says—

*Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam meam in vitam æternam. Amen.*

T.—May the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

R.—*Sumit totum sanguinem cum particula. Quo sumpto si qui sunt communicandi eos communicet. Postea dicit. Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus, ut de munere temporali fiat nobis remedium sumpsiternam.*

T.—He takes the whole blood with the particle, (which was mixed with it before,) which, being taken or drunk, if there are any persons to receive the communion, let him communicate to them. After that he

says, “What we have taken with the mouth, may we receive with a pure mind, and of a temporal gift, may it become an eternal medicine to us.”

Here, again, we have the wine distinctly spoken of, as the blood of our Lord ; and we would here propose a similar question to that proposed before—What is that particle which is mixed with the blood ? Is it our Lord’s body, or part of his body ? And the idea of his body, or part of his body, being floating in his blood, is such a gross, unscriptural thought, that we really are at a loss to know how such a supposition could be entertained for a moment by any reasonable persons.

You only receive the wafer, or, as you suppose, the body of our Lord. If that be sufficient for you, why not for the priest ? Why are all those forms of consecration of the wine made use of, unless in compliance, as you teach, with the command of our Lord. Surely, upon the same principle, then, you have no excuse for withholding the chalice or wine from the people who communicate, and commanding the priest to drink the entire himself. Antiquity, and the Holy Scriptures, the word of our Lord himself, condemn your present practice.

R.—*Interim porrigit calicem ministro qui infundit in eo, parum vini, quo se purificat deinde prosequitur.*

T.—In the mean while, he holds forth the chalice to the attendant, who pours into it a little wine, with which he purifies himself. He then proceeds :

What is the meaning here of his pouring into the chalice a little wine, and purifying himself with it ? How can a person be purified with wine ? Besides, upon your own principles, this must be quite unnecessary. Remember all the times the priest has made the sign of the cross upon himself up to this part of the Mass ; and surely if there be any virtue in “crossings,” the Powers of darkness must have been completely driven away long before. Consider, also, the holy water which he has cast upon himself—the incense which has been used to purify him. The blessed candles

which are lighted also, and which your church teaches are endued with many great virtues. Take all these holy ceremonies together, and surely you must admit it to be very strange, and inconsistent, to say that purification is still necessary. But again, perhaps the object of this purification, by the wine being poured into the chalice, and upon his fingers in which he has held the consecrated host, is to wash away all the particles or crumbs which may adhere to his fingers. Could this rubric have been made if the belief in the wafer or bread being the real body of our Lord prevailed, could it be taught that washing away so many bodies of our Lord—for your church, in her infallible wisdom, teaches that each crumb is a separate and distinct body—can be a cleansing or a purification? Surely such an expression would never have been used, for there can be no defilement in the touch of the body of our Lord. The truth is, this furnishes us with an additional proof of the novelty of many of the doctrines of your Mass; and of the inconsistency of one part with the other.

Corpus tuum, Domine, quod sumpsi, et sanguis quem potavi, adhæreat visceribus meis, et præsta ut in me non remaneat scelerum macula, quem pura et sancta refecerunt sacramenta. Qui vivis et regnas in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

T.—May thy body, O Lord, which I have taken, and thy blood which I have drunk, adhere to my bowels; and grant, that there may not remain a spot of wickedness in me, whom thy pure and holy sacraments have refreshed; who livest and reignest forever and ever. Amen.

Here we find the distinction between the body and blood of our Lord still kept up; but how to explain the prayer that that body and blood may adhere or cling to the bowels of the priest, I confess is beyond my power—even upon Roman Catholic grounds. What, brethren, is it for a moment to be supposed that this is possible? I cannot dwell upon all the blasphemous consequences to which such a monstrous tenet must give rise; nor

can you avoid those consequences, unless you totally reject, as the Word of God expressly teaches you to do, all carnal notions respecting the presence of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament.

There is a very remarkable circumstance recorded in the word of God, Exod. xxxii. 20. When Moses went up to the mount of God to receive the law, during his absence, which continued for forty days, the people became impatient, and not expecting him to return to them any more, persuaded Aaron, the brother of Moses, to make a golden calf, similar to what they had witnessed in Egypt; and this golden calf was to be the representative of that God who had brought them out of Egypt. Mark this well, brethren; we are not informed by Moses that the children of Israel worshipped the golden calf—as supposing that there was any peculiar virtue or power contained in it—on the contrary, they worshipped it only as a personification of the Deity of God the Creator. They said, “These be thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” And Aaron made proclamation and said, To-morrow is a feast to the Lord—thus showing that it was God, the Lord Jehovah, whom they wished to worship under this representation. We find St. Stephen, (Acts vii. 41,) when alluding to this circumstance of their idolatry, expressing himself thus:—“And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice to the idol, and rejoiced in the work of their own hands.” Now see, is not this applicable to you? You make images, the personification of those whose name they bear—you bow down before them, and adore them in open violation of God’s expressed prohibition, in the first or second commandment, (Exodus xxiv. 2-5;) and to sum up all your monstrous disobedience to the plain teaching of God’s inspired apostles, you make a cake or wafer, your church say some Latin prayers over it, and then you are called upon to worship it as God, and you do worship it.

See how the children of Israel were punished—and see how the senselessness of their conduct was shown.

While in the very act of their idolatrous worship of this calf, the representative of God—Moses (who had been previously informed by God himself of their wickedness) returned, and broke the calf in pieces, and burnt it, and ground it to powder, strewed it upon water, and made the people drink it. Why was this done? And why is it recorded in the Book of God, *but to teach us all the folly of worshipping any thing we can drink or eat?* Apply this to your own practice—you worship the blood of Christ—you worship the body of Christ—and you think you eat and drink them; thus you think you are doing that very act which the Holy Ghost, in the above passage, declares is a proof that such are *not proper objects for worship at all.* Surely, we never should have thought of worshipping the dead body of our Lord, when it was taken down from the cross. His disciples never attempted such a thing until they beheld that body again reanimated and filled with the Divinity. God is a spirit, saith our Lord, (John iv. 24,) and they that worship *him* must worship him in spirit and truth; and Jesus as God is thus to be worshipped. “The flesh profiteth nothing,” John vi. 63. You are only degrading the Deity by such profane and ungodly notions, and wilfully shutting your eyes to that clear and express testimony given in the written word as to the manner of worship God expects from man.

Let us suppose poison mixed with the consecrated bread or consecrated wine, are we to be told that this entire poisoned mass is changed into the body and blood of Christ, and therefore is deprived of its hurtful properties, and may be safely partaken of. This your church will not presume to assert, because the test of the truth of such an assertion is easily tried, and the consecrating priest may himself make the experiment in the presence of you all; and then, surely, if your church really possesses, as she asserts she does, the power of working miracles—if her followers and children are those who exclusively follow the commands of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—he need not apprehend any ill consequences. They, said our blessed

Lord, meaning his faithful children, were endued in those early days with the power of proving their mission by the working of miracles, which your church, as we have stated above, asserts has descended to, and continues with you. They shall take up serpents, and if *they shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them*, Mark xvi. 18. Thus you see your priest may safely make the experiment, and prove the truth of your doctrine in his own person: and if he fears to do this, and I anticipate such will be the case, surely the entire system, even from this circumstance, may be known to be false, as your own Church History furnishes us with many instances of very eminent persons being murdered by poisoned hosts being administered to them in the sacrament.

R.—Abluit digitos extergerit et sumit ablutionem, extergerit os et calicem quem operit, et picato corporali collocat in altare ut prius. Deinde prosequitur missam.

T.—He washes his fingers, and wipes them, and drinks the oblation. He wipes his mouth and the chalice, which he covers, and folding the corporale round it, places it upon the altar as at first. Then he proceeds with the Mass:—

R.—Dicto post ultimam orationem: Dominus vobis-cum. Res.—Et cum spiritu tuo.

T.—Having said after the last prayer: The Lord be with you. Res.—And with thy Spirit.

R.—Dicit pro qualitate missæ vel benedicimus Domino. Res.—Deo Gratias.

T.—He says, according to the quality of the Mass, either—Let us bless the Lord. Res.—Thanks be to God. There are various other endings according to the period of the year.

R.—Dicto ite missa est, vel benedicamus Domino, sacerdos inclinat se ante medium altaris et manibus junctis super illud dicit.

T.—Having said—Depart, it is the sending away, (meaning Mass is ended,) or, Let us bless the Lord—the

priest bows himself before the middle of the altar, and with his hands joined over it says—

Placeat tibi, sancta Trinitas, obsequium servitutis meæ, et præsta ut sacrificium quod oculis tuæ majestatis indignus obtuli, tibi sit acceptabile, mihique et omnibus pro quibus illud obtuli, sit, te miserante, propitiabile. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

T.—May the performance of my service be acceptable to thee, O blessed Trinity, and grant that the sacrifice which I, unworthy, have offered before the eyes of thy Majesty, may be acceptable to thee, and that it may be propitiatory by thy compassion for me, and for all for whom I have offered it; through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Mark now, the priest prays, as you are taught by your church, that the sacrifice which has been offered, may be acceptable and propitiatory, that is, atoning for his own sins and those for whom the offering is made. This offering, as you are taught, is the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. You beseech the blessed Trinity, one of the Persons of whom is Jesus himself, to accept his own body and blood as an atonement. This atonement has been made before by Jesus as man; and then you sum up all these inventions of man, by saying, through Christ our Lord—calling on Jesus to receive himself his own body and blood by his own intercession. I cannot understand this prayer; and really, so far as understanding the meaning of many of your most inconsistent prayers, you may as well have them in Latin as in English—for in both they are equally unintelligible.

R.—Deinde osculatur altare, et elevatis oculis et jungens manus, caputque crux inclinans dicit—Benedicat nos Omnipotens Deus, et versus ad populum semel tantum benedicens etiam missis solemnibus prosequitur. Pater et Filius,  et Spiritus Sanctus. Res.—Amen.

T.—Then he kisses the altar, and lifting up his eyes, extending, raising, and joining his hands, and bowing his head to the cross, says—May the Almighty God bless

you ; and turning to the people, pronouncing the blessing only once, even in solemn Masses, he proceeds, saying—Father, Son,  and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Here your church has introduced a form totally opposed to God's express commandment—bowing before the cross. In the second commandment, which is generally omitted in the catechism put into the hands of your people by your priests, there is an absolute and positive prohibition against making the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, for the purpose of bowing down before them, or adoring, or worshipping them. You may say, you adore not the cross, but him who hung thereon, even Jesus. Surely, if that be true, you are not to look for him there, but in heaven. Have you not sufficiently degraded the Saviour, by teaching that his glorious body and blood, which are in heaven, are not merely represented, or figured, or typified by the bread and the wine, which is the true doctrine of the Bible and the ancient church ; but that this wretched wafer and this wine are changed into them ; and you pay this false body the same divine honor which you should pay to the Lord of life and glory himself ; you also in total and direct contempt of the positive precepts of God himself, Exodus xx. 4, which are their only sure and safe guides, and which your church, as far forth as she can, keeps from the knowledge of her people, bow before the image on the cross, identifying that which was made by man—the workmanship of man—with Jesus, the eternal and living God.

Hear what Jesus himself says, John iv. 23, 24 : “The hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth ; for the Father seeketh all such to adore him. God is a Spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth.” Again, Jesus says, “I and my Father are one.” John x. 30. God cannot be represented. Isaiah xl. 18. Nothing that we make or paint can resemble him ; and, therefore, it is with the heart we must worship, and also

"*in truth;* " that is, in strict accordance with those rules and precepts laid down in the revealed word of God—the holy Scriptures—the source of all truth. Look to Isaiah, also, xliv. 9–20 ; and you will there see the folly of image-making and image-worship clearly set forth. Hear, also, Habakkuk, iii. 18, 19, where wo is expressly denounced against those who excuse the making of images and pictures for worship, saying they are to teach the ignorant, and are the book of the unlearned—the very same reasons which your church gives to justify your doing so. "What profiteth the graven image that the maker thereof hath graven it ? The molten image and a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein to make dumb idols. Wo unto him that saith to the wood, awake—to the dumb stone, arise, it shall teach. Behold it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no truth at all in the midst of it." Mark the words following :—"But the Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before him." Here we learn from this passage that the Lord does not delegate his authority to any. All the earth are to obey his commands, as set forth in his revealed word, in silence and with submission ; and we find St. Paul, when alluding, as we believe, to your church with the pope at its head, says : "that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God." 2 Thess. ii. 4, &c. &c. &c. ; compare also Dan. vii. 25, and xi. 36.

It would lead me too far from my present purpose to point out to you those prophecies which describe your church most accurately, and foretell the final downfall of this antisciptural power who usurps the place of God, and presumes to give new laws contrary to those laid down by God in his holy commandments, and in that sacred volume, which is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. 2 Tim. iii. 15. Your church attempts to justify the use of images by the cherubim which God commanded Moses to make, and to place over the mercy-seat. Exod. xxv. 18. We shall find that so far from this justifying the making

of images for the purpose of enlivening our devotion by addressing those who are represented by them, that we may learn that the very contrary is taught. In the first place we may remark, that the people saw not these cherubim at all. They were in the holy of holies, to which they had no access, nor the high priest, but once a year. They could scarcely be seen by him, the place being dark. However, hear what God said to Moses : " And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another, toward the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubim lie, and thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark, and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee : and there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Exod. xxv. 20-22.

When the high priest entered this holy of holies, whom did he address ? Was it the cherubim ? No, but God declared he would answer from between the cherubim. Was there any image or likeness made of God, as your church blasphemously teaches should be done, and which is to be seen in many of your places of worship, in open defiance of God's own command ? There was nothing of the kind. A voice answered the high priest, or Moses, not from the cherubim, but from the space between them. Why were the cherubim placed there by God's command, but to teach you the contrast between God and any image, and to show you that God can be addressed without the intervention of any such intermediate beings ; for surely neither Moses nor the high priest would ever contemplate the worship of, or bowing down to the golden cherubim, in God's presence. As even in the presence of an earthly king, all respect must centre in his person, so, as God is present everywhere, it is downright and flagrant idolatry, to give the images of saints or angels any species of worship or adoration. David, Psalm xxx. 1, calls upon God, and

says, "Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth." The truth is, no passage can more strongly show the uselessness of images to enliven our devotion, or to make our prayers more acceptable, than this very one ; as, though they were there by God's express authority and command, no worship was paid them : they were looked upon in no other light than that of any ordinary ornamental work about the ark.

But see how your church resembles the Gentiles of whom St. Paul speaks, Rom. i. 22. "Professing themselves wise they became fools, and they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man." And St. Stephen, Acts vii. 42, speaking of the disobedience of the children of Israel, says, "And God turned, and gave them up to serve the host of heaven." Thus you serve, and address in prayers, not merely departed saints, but the angels, or hosts of God, as your prayers fully show.

Scripture cannot contradict itself. God's commands are ever the same as to his worship, and it remains for you to justify the open breach of one of the plainest precepts given in the Scriptures. The introduction of images into the church was vehemently opposed at various periods. There was, in the eighth century, a powerful party called Iconoclasts, or image-breakers, who, in their zeal, broke all the idolatrous images which were beginning to be introduced into the churches, and several councils were held upon the subject, and decrees made for and against their use. The opposition of those councils to each other, furnishes an additional argument against their infallibility, as no third power has been fixed upon to decide which council is the true one, or what those essentials are which are necessary to constitute a true council ; each party—the supporters and opposers of image-worship—asserting that the decree in their favor is that which is right. Thus, in order to arrive at the truth, we must come to the apostolic teaching, as set forth in Holy Scripture, the only safe guide.

R.—In Missa Pontificali ter benedicitur ut in Pontificali habetur.

T.—In a Pontifical Mass the blessing is three times pronounced, as is stated in the pontifical service.

R.—Deinde in cornu evangelii dicto “Dominus vobis-cum” et initium vel sequentia sancti evangelii. Signans altare vel librum et se ut supra in evangelio Missæ. Legit evangelium secundum Johannem. “In principio est verbum” ut infra—vel aliud evangelium ut dictum est in rubris generalibus. Cum dicit “et verbum caro factum est,” genuflectit. In fine, Res—Gratias.

T.—Then at the Gospel side of the altar, having said “the Lord be with you,” and “the initium” (beginning) or “the sequentiæ” (or the following) of the blessed Gospel, he signs the altar or the book and himself with the sign of the cross, as above in the Gospel of the Mass; he then reads the Gospel according to John, chap. i.—“In the beginning was the Word,” as follows, or another Gospel as is appointed in the general rubrics. When he says “and the Word was made flesh,” he kneels. At the conclusion, the Response—Thanks be to God.

We have now gone through the canon of the Mass; it has been my sincere wish to magnify or exaggerate nothing; but, avoiding all misrepresentations, to give every thing plainly and simply.

Your church, for her own reasons,—chiefly, we fear, for the purpose of aggrandizing herself in your estimation,—has sought to persuade you that your priests have received the power from our Lord, of producing him before you, in the form of bread and wine. The natural consequence follows: you believe, and naturally, that that church must be the peculiarly favored church of God, which is endowed with such privileges; that God must look with especial favor upon you; and, consequently, you believe that it is utterly impossible that any erroneous doctrine could be taught by a church so peculiarly favored and protected. Alas! my dear brethren, how entirely must all this confidence vanish, when

you refer to the written Word of God,—even to your own Scriptures, many translations of which I believe not only to be incorrect, but rendered *wilfully obscure*, in order to impress you with the idea that they are not easily understood ; and you are thus forced to have recourse to those guides whose interest it is to keep you from the true light, and to give you instead thereof, *darkness, confusion, and inconsistency*.

I will now proceed to give you a brief description of the Protestant views respecting the Blessed Sacrament. They are represented to you as destroying the essential parts of the Sacrament, or of having nothing spiritual or religious in their service. Any person who is conversant with Holy Scripture, must be aware of the figurative language so frequently used. Indeed you do the same in your Mass, for you constantly make the chalice or cup *represent* his blood. Our blessed Lord calls himself a door, John x. 7—a vine tree, John xv. 1. He is called the Morning Star, Rev. xxii. 16—lamb, John xxix. 36 ; and we know that those expressions are not to be understood literally. In like manner, our Lord describes the spiritual blessings conveyed to the soul of the sincere believer, under the figure of water. “He that shall drink of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst,” John iv. 14 ; and in John vi. 35, to which we alluded before, he says, “I am the bread of life ; he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.” Again, verse 47, he says, “Amen, amen, I say unto you, he that believeth in me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life.” Our Lord then says, verse 52, “If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever ; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” The Jews, not understanding our Lord’s meaning, were astonished at what he said, and interpreting him literally, as you are taught to do, inquired, “How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?” Our Lord then, instead of laying aside his figurative language, goes further, and says, “Amen, amen, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall

not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life." He had said in verse 47, "He that believeth in me hath everlasting life;" thus clearly identifying the meaning of eating the body and drinking the blood, with believing in him ; the doing or neglecting of either being attended with the same consequence.

If you refer the eating his body, or drinking his blood, to the partaking of the consecrated elements, in a literal sense, certain consequences will necessarily follow, to which you cannot assent. One is, that no person, young or old, can be saved, who does not partake of the body and blood of our Lord in the Eucharist, at least once. And secondly, that whosoever does, *is certain of being saved* ; and, therefore, that all your vain forms and *new* doctrines, such as purgatory, private confession, absolution, extreme unction, holy water, blessed candles, &c. &c., are entirely useless ; as the eating the body and drinking the blood, in your sense, in the Eucharist, is the grand essential, as the doing so will be blessed with eternal life.

There is another matter, also, to be considered, as connected with the literal interpretation of this passage, and that is, that you must receive *both the body and the blood* ; to this we alluded before. In vain you say you receive both under one kind ; but mark the expression—*drink* the blood, and that you cannot do, while you are only *eating* the wafer or bread. We must, therefore, search for some other meaning of this passage—"this saying," said they, "is hard, who can hear it?" v. 61 ; and so it must have appeared to them, if they supposed our Blessed Lord meant his flesh and blood, literally, as the Jews were positively prohibited from the drinking or using the blood *of any manner of flesh*, Lev. xvii. 14. Observe how comprehensive the prohibition—*any manner of flesh* ; and it is most remarkable, that we find this very prohibition continued by the Council of the Apostles, where the Gentiles were expressly commanded to abstain from blood, Acts xv. 20, 29. And no exception whatever is

made in favor of drinking the blood of the Lord Jesus, as if the Spirit of God foresaw the grievous errors which would be introduced into the Church in after ages. Even upon your own principles, the *body* of our Lord is not permitted, by the Word of God, to be eaten. "The flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof," is forbidden, Gen. ix. 4. So that the flesh and the blood *mingled together*, are absolutely forbidden; and this restriction is continued in the above-quoted passages from the Acts of the Apostles—where the Gentile converts are commanded to abstain from eating *things strangled*, or from those animals which have not had the blood drawn away. Bring your doctrine of "Concomitance," or of both body and blood being united in either species of bread and wine to this test, and see whether it will bear examination. In your sense, then, both the body and blood are absolutely forbidden.\*

The Jews, therefore, did not comprehend our Lord's meaning; they understood not the spiritual doctrine of the cross, and, therefore, objected to what our Lord said. But Jesus knowing that even his own disciples (v. 62) were murmuring against him, as they would naturally do, from their misunderstanding his expressions and supposing he was teaching some new doctrines opposed to the law of Moses, said—"Doth this scandalize? If, then, ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before." The Jews, we are told, v. 41, murmured, because our Lord said, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." They interpreted his meaning literally, when he called himself bread. He now tells them that they will see a more astonishing thing than even that, namely, the Son of Man ascending up again into heaven; and thus showing them, that they were *mistaking his meaning* of eating his body and drinking his blood—for they would no more have it in their power to do so in a lit-

\* The Latin Vulgate says, Gen. ix. 4, "Carnem cum sanguine non comedetis." "You shall not eat flesh with the blood;" that is, *together*, as you profess to do in the Eucharist.

eral, carnal manner, his body having ascended to heaven, and being to remain there at his Father's right hand, than to eat that bread, which he calls himself, before he came down from heaven. He then proceeds to clear up his meaning, v. 64, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth—the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and life."

Thus the doctrine of literally eating his body, and drinking his blood, profits nothing, but leads us into errors, mistakes, and absurdities, as we see in your Mass; but the spiritual sense and feeling of his death enlivens, and, by divine grace, animates or quickens the soul—the believer derives consolation and encouragement in his approaches to God, by a consciousness of what his Saviour has suffered for him; and he feels that he is the only apparent door or way by which he can obtain an entrance to eternal life.

After our blessed Lord had, by this truly divine discourse, prepared the minds of his disciples for his death, and by those other discourses recorded by St. John, before his Last Supper, John xiii. and following chapters; he instituted that sacred feast which has been the chief subject of the preceding pages. And it is most remarkable, that the disciples no longer murmured at his expressions—of eating his body and drinking his blood, used at his Last Supper. They no longer objected to what he said—and why? Because our Lord had before so fully explained his meaning that he was to be understood only in a spiritual sense. Besides, only just before the celebration of the Last Supper, a circumstance is recorded, which bears upon the question recorded by St. Matthew, xxv. 31; and by all the other Evangelists—in the house of Simon the leper, a certain woman came and poured a box of very precious ointment upon our Lord's head, as he sat at meat. The disciples complained of this being an act of great waste, and that it might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. But our Lord rebuked them for troubling the woman who had thus shown her love and her devotedness to his service, and said—"She hath wrought a

good work upon me ; for the poor you have always with you, but me ye have not always : for she, in pouring this ointment upon my body, hath done it for my burial." Here our blessed Lord plainly speaks of his *body*, and tells his disciples they are not to have it always with them ; he tells them it is to be buried—and, upon another occasion, they are told that it ascended to God's right hand. "Why stand you looking up to heaven, ye men of Galilee?" said the two angels in white garments, Acts i. 10, 11, "this Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as ye have seen him going into heaven." Mark, *shall so come* ; not in the degrading way that your Church falsely tells you he is brought by your priest upon the altar in the shape of a *little round bit of bread*, but with glory, majesty, and power, to reward his faithful servants, and to punish those who have not submitted themselves to his commands. Does it not appear truly remarkable, that our Lord should, in the above-quoted passage, speak of "his body" in such a manner that when, a short time after, he gave the disciples the bread, and said, "This is my body," they never could have confounded the one with the other ; they took it and the wine, therefore, as the representation of that body and blood which the woman had anointed, and which was shortly to be broken and shed upon the cross, and to be buried, and ascend to God's right hand.

Our Lord had, also, upon another occasion, given them instructions which they might profitably apply to the present case—"Do ye not understand," said our Lord, "that *whatsoever entereth into the mouth*, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?" Matt. xv. 17. To this degradation, your Roman Church would reduce the *real* body and blood of our Lord, when you partake of it, as you are taught by her at the Eucharist. Thus you see that the Apostles of our Lord never contemplated such a doctrine as yours. Their blessed Master had fully instructed them upon this subject ; and it is also clear that their views continued unchanged, as it was some years after these

facts were committed to writing. May the Lord direct you to the study of his word, may it be blessed to your souls, and may you be directed in the right path, and delivered from these absurd and wicked delusions.

What, then, are we to consider as the eating the body, and drinking the blood of our Blessed Lord, in the Holy Sacrament? Is it the eating the consecrated bread, or drinking the consecrated wine? By no means; for we may press with our teeth the consecrated bread, and take with our mouths the consecrated wine, and, at the same time, not eat the body, or drink the blood of our Lord. The Catechism of the Church of England\* well and scripturally expresses this, where, in answer to the question—What is the inward part, or thing *signified* by the outward and visible signs of bread and wine which the Lord commanded to be received? We are told—The body and blood of Christ, which are, verily and indeed, taken and received by *the faithful* at the Lord's Supper. Mark the expression—only by *the faithful*; it is by the entire act of faith exhibited by *the faithful* communicant. Reflect what the feelings of the believer are, when he comes to the Lord's table; there is an acknowledgment of the authority of the Lord Jesus, by whose appointment this feast was instituted. There is an acknowledgment, that it is to the sufferings of that body, broken and torn by the thorns, the scourgings, the nails, and the spear, and to that precious blood which flowed from those wounds, that he is indebted for pardon. Surely, he will receive with awe and with gratitude, those elements—that bread and that wine, consecrated or dedicated for such a holy purpose, by the express authority of his Saviour, as reminding him of those means by which man's salvation has been accomplished; and he will feel assured that a special blessing will attend his obedience to his Master's dying precept, and that a more abundant emanation of divine grace and

\* Part of this question and answer is deceitfully quoted by Roman Catholic writers to prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation; whereas, if the entire passage were given, it would prove the very reverse.

energy will be communicated to his soul—thus he truly partakes of the body and blood of his Saviour.

The *entire act*, done with faith, is eating the body, and drinking the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, of which the bread and the wine are only the emblems especially appointed by divine institution. This feeling of the mind, constitutes the eating of the body and the drinking the blood of the Saviour, to which he himself attaches the promise of eternal life; John vi. 55. And that these feelings are not exclusively confined to the receiving the Lord's Supper, and that this is the view taken by the Protestant churches, is clear from the rubric at the communion of the sick, in her Book of Common Prayer; where, if for some of those reasons there stated, the Communion of the Lord's Supper cannot be administered, the curate is enjoined to instruct the sick person—"That if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath therein, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, he doth *eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ*, profitably to his soul's health, although he does not receive the sacrament with his mouth." Nothing can be clearer or more to the purpose than this passage.

I will now bring before you two of those prayers used by the Protestant Church; and you will find how entirely they agree with Holy Scripture, and what we have before shown to be the doctrine of the Primitive Apostolic Church; one is the prayer immediately before the consecration, and the other is the prayer of consecration:—

"We do not presume to come to this, thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy table; but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body,

and our souls washed through his most precious blood ; and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen."

#### "THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.

" Almighty God, and Heavenly Father, who, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world ; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that, his most precious death, until his coming again. Hear us, most merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood, who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, (here the priest is to take the paten in his hand,) and when he had given thanks, he brake it, (and here to break the bread,) and gave it to his disciples, saying : take, eat, this is my body, (here to lay his hand upon all the bread,) which is given for you ; do this, in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper, he took the cup, (here he is to take the cup into his hand,) and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying : Drink ye all of this, for this (and here to lay his hand upon every vessel, be it chalice or flagon, in which there is any wine to be consecrated, that is *to be set apart for holy purposes, not transubstantiated*) is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins : do this, as oft as you shall drink of it, in remembrance of me. Amen."

Thus you see the Protestant Church, in her celebration of the Lord's Supper or Eucharist, has endeavored to adhere to the Word of God, and to the practice of the ancient church, where that is in conformity with Holy Scripture. Can you make the same assertion,

with truth, as to your own Roman Church ? Alas ! no ; your multiplied forms, your bowings, your signings with the sign of the cross, your holy water, your blessed candles, your incense, we seek for in vain in the Word of God. The truth is, we cannot conceive any two things more unlike than your Mass, as celebrated at present by your church, and the institution of our blessed Lord ; so much so, that, as before observed, if one of the blessed apostles, who was present at the first communion by our Lord, beheld your Mass, he could never recognise the one by the other.

I will now bring before you a few of the differences between our Lord's manner of celebration, and that of your Roman Church.

1.—Our Lord addressed those present in a language they understood. Your people understand not the Latin which is spoken ; the priest calling you "brethren," speaks to you in Latin, inviting you to do certain things in the Mass. What a mockery ? How can you comply ?

2.—It was after supper the communion was given. You or your priest dare not, under the guilt of mortal sin, eat or drink any thing before, though you may eat and drink as much as you please immediately after ; and thus you confound in your stomachs what you eat and drink of your ordinary food with that you believe to be the body and blood of our Lord.

3.—We read of no "incense" being used ; we hear of no "bells" being rung ; we hear of no "crossings;" we hear of no moving about from one side to another of the altar or table, of no kneelings down and gettings up—making the whole ceremony appear like a theatrical exhibition.

4.—We hear of no reliques, holy bones, or blessed garments of saints, being placed under the altar, as necessary to give increased sanctity to the place and ceremony ; upon your own grounds, most inconsistently, and, alas ! impiously concluding that the body and blood of our Lord are not sufficient for such a purpose.

5.—Our Lord took bread and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and told them to eat. Your church can-

not do this, for you say it has become his body ; and, instead of always giving it to the people present, you pray that it may be carried up to heaven, by an angel, as an offering for sin, when Jesus is there himself already, his work being finished, John xvii. 4 ; xix. 30.

6.—You cannot break the body, as Jesus did the bread, because you say it multiplies at every division ; so that the smallest crumb or particle you make of the bread, becomes a body.

7.—In solitary Masses, the people eat not, only the priest ; and in some public Masses, oftentimes the same occurs ; therefore, the words of our Lord, as repeated by you in Latin, are only a mockery, and would appear more absurd if you understood the invitation to partake, which you were not allowed to accept.

8.—Our Lord gave the chalice to all present, and said expressly—“*Drink ye all of it.*” Your church does not obey this command.

9.—Our Lord says : “Take and eat : this is my body.” You, instead of taking and eating it, fall down and worship that piece of bread or wafer, which our Lord meant only to represent his body ; as he calls himself a door, a vine, &c.

10.—Our Lord has told us, to do this in remembrance of him ; and the apostle tells us that by our doing so, that is, eating the bread and drinking the chalice, “we show the Lord’s death until he come” from the right hand of God, 1 Cor. xi. 26, where he now is. This is unintelligible, upon the supposition that his body, blood, soul, and divinity are present upon the altar already. We are not said to “remember” what we are looking at ; and, surely, the apostle could never have spoken of the future coming of the Lord, if he were come already, and if every officiating priest held him in his hands. We may here remark, that the translation of the original words in either Greek or Latin, by the expression, “show,” does not convey the true meaning. The words signify “declare,” “tell forth,” “publish,” “proclaim.” Your church makes the Mass a sort of history of the Passion of our Lord ; teaching you that each part of the

Mass has a reference to some circumstance of our Lord's sufferings; and thus you understand the words. But in the Eucharist, we proclaim our belief in the death of the Saviour. In the Eucharist, we declare that he hath died for sin; and by our continuing to obey his dying command of celebrating his Last Supper in the manner appointed by himself, in remembrance of him, we admit his authority, we feel his presence; remembering what he himself has told us, Mat. xviii. 20—“Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;” and we feel assured that he will fulfil his promise that he will never be absent from the government of his church which he has established, until the consummation of all things: and that the rules and laws of that government, as set forth in Holy Scripture, admit of no change, and that no power in heaven or on earth can interfere with that authority which Jesus, as mediator, has received from the Father.

11.—Again, the disciples took the bread and the wine themselves from the hands of our Lord, and eat or *chewed* the bread, like any ordinary food. Your priest takes the wafer and places it upon your tongues, which you are expressly commanded not to chew, but to swallow entire—the wine is not given at all.

12.—Every thing our Lord spoke, he uttered in an audible voice. Your priest says many of the prayers to himself.

13.—The bread was eaten in our Lord's time. Your church frequently locks up in a little box that which she calls our Lord's body, and which you worship as such; and against which, as we before observed, you are cautioned, Mat. xxiv. 26.

14.—There was no mention by our Lord or his apostles of prayer for saints' and angels' intercession; no confession to them of sins; no allusion made to their merits at the Last Supper.

15.—Your church also teaches, that in your Mass there is a propitiatory sacrifice for both living and dead. In the Lord's Supper we find no marks of any such; as

was stated in the preceding pages, there was a full and complete sacrifice “*finished*” on Calvary. And your church teaches, that although our Lord is not offered in a “bloody” manner, yet still he is in an unbloody manner in the Mass. Here, again, we have another evidence of the inconsistence of your doctrines with each other. St. Paul, Romans vi. 9, says—“Knowing that Christ rising again from the dead, dieth now no more.” And again, God says, Gen. ix. 4, “the blood is the life;” but to have his blood drunk by the priests, and still to believe his *body to be alive*, requires the most unbounded confidence in the teaching of your church, which there supersedes the authority of God himself. Nothing, you say, is impossible with God. We admit this—except to assert that which is untrue. And we fearlessly say, that it is utterly impossible for the God of holiness and truth, who caused the Holy Scriptures, as he tells us by his inspired servants, to be written for our instruction, to require us to believe and to practise what he, in those same Scriptures, so openly condemns. His word tells you the *one sacrifice is perfect and sufficient*: by your acts you profess to disbelieve it. St. Paul tells you, Heb. x. 18, “there is no more an oblation for sin;” you disbelieve St. Paul, and adhere to the teaching of your false church, which is only leading you on to destruction.

I could easily multiply the differences between your Mass and the Lord’s Supper; but sufficient have been mentioned to show you how little pretensions your church has to call herself apostolical, as being governed by the apostolic rules and writings.

I shall now endeavor to show you, from your own writers, at what periods the different parts of the Mass were added.

You can easily discover, by reference to the Gospels, how our Blessed Lord instituted it; you can there learn the forms which he used—how few and how simple. Next we come to St. Paul, and we find in the eleventh chap. of 1 Cor., to which we have frequently referred, the manner in which our Lord had commanded his

Last Supper to be celebrated. "I have received from the Lord," Paul tells us, ver. 23, "that which also I delivered unto you, that," &c. We next bring you to the second century, and refer you to the account given by Justin Martyr of the manner in which the Eucharist was then celebrated ; and the only change or addition we find, is water being used, and the meaning of this was showed you before : a proof also that the church in those days did not believe in the wine being changed into the blood of our Lord ; as, if so, they *never would have had water mixed* with it. The reason of this is plain. Mixing the water with the wine, as we observed before, had allusion to the water and blood which flowed from the wounded side of the Lord Jesus. Surely the church never taught that the water was changed into this *very same water* which flowed from his body. It was used only to *represent* the water ; and, in like manner, the wine was never considered as becoming *the same blood*, but only representing it, like the water. To believe that the water remains only common water, and that the wine becomes that very same blood, and yet that they are to be mixed together, involves absurdities utterly repugnant to common sense, as well as to primitive belief. Both the bread and the wine were given to all ; but not a sentence do we find about all those vain, foolish, and contradictory forms and ceremonies which were subsequently introduced, and upon which we have so strongly commented in the preceding pages. No elevation of the bread and wine ; no adoration of elements : all plain and simple. The truth is, the Roman Mass gradually assumed its present shape ; and as new doctrines were introduced, it became necessary to have additional prayers and forms to suit these novelties.

In the fifth century the "Judica me Deus" and the Introite were added by Pope Celestine.

The "Confiteor," as now used, filled with idolatrous petitions, is not older than the eleventh century. There was a public confession introduced by Bishop Damasus, in the fourth century, but it differed widely from your

present one. Private confession to a priest, in order to obtain absolution, was unknown in those days.

The "Gloria in Excelsis" was introduced by Pope Symmachus in the sixth century.

The "Kyrie Eleison," and several other short prayers, were taken from the Greek Liturgies.

Gregory I., as he is called, who was bishop of Rome in the sixth, and beginning of the seventh century, brought in several most important additions to the Mass. He also introduced the Lord's Prayer immediately after the canon; because, as he said, "the apostles had a custom of consecrating the oblation with this prayer only," (Dupin, *De Vita Gregorii.*) There was little notion in those times of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The elevation or adoring the consecrated host is only comparatively modern. Bona, a Roman author, to whom we have before alluded, and who is considered of high authority in the Roman church, admits that this practice is of late introduction. If we are asked when the host was elevated and adored as the body and blood of our Lord, we answer, that the practice was introduced in the thirteenth century. The first constitution upon the subject, is that of Honorius III., who was pope in the year of our Lord 1216. It is as follows:—"That priests should often teach their people that at the celebration of Mass, when the host is lifted up, they should kneel with respect, and that they should also kneel when the priest carries it to any sick person."

Gregory IX., who succeeded Honorius, A. D. 1227, invented the custom of ringing a bell to warn the people to fall down upon their knees to adore the consecrated host. Thus you perceive that many of those practices which you now use at Mass, and which you are taught to believe were from the beginning, are innovations, and were utterly unknown to the Primitive Church. No sooner was the doctrine of transubstantiation received in the Roman Church, than, as we before stated, numerous forms and doctrines succeeded. The taking away the cup from the people followed;

also the doctrine of "concomitance," or that both the body and blood were in each species ; and the elevation and adoration of the host, none of which practices, of course, we can expect to find before the belief prevailed of the substance of bread and the wine being changed into the *very* body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I have before me a little book, of which a stereotyped edition is published by the Irish Catholic Book Society. It is called "Manning's Short Way to end Disputes." I refer you to page 119, &c., where there is an endeavor to show that the Mass was said from the earliest times of Christianity. If by Mass, we reply, you mean the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, we admit such to be true. The Lord's Supper was celebrated from the beginning by our Lord himself first. There is a quotation made, in this book, from Gregory's writings, who lived in the sixth and seventh centuries, as follows : (to show that Pope Gregory said Mass in the sixth century, and that therefore the Mass is as old as his times,) — "Since, God willing, I shall say Mass thrice to-day, I cannot be very long in my discourse upon the Gospel." But this Mass which Gregory said, was a very different service from what you use in your chapels, as I think we have fully shown ; in fact, it was nothing but the Lord's Supper. Manning goes on to say, page 120 — "The most ancient of the fathers have left us an account of the manner of celebrating Mass in their days, as Justin Martyr." We have already seen, in the early part of this work, a quotation by one of your own authors, of the manner that, not the Mass, but the Eucharist, was celebrated in his day. Surely Justin, if now alive, and present at your service, would never recognise your present practices as having any resemblance with the forms then used. "The Roman Liturgy," Manning proceeds to tell us, "is likewise very ancient, as appears from the sacramentary or ritual of Pope Gregory I., who abridged the liturgy of Pope Gelasius, a father of the fifth age, (this, we must remind you, was the pope who so expressly commanded both species of bread and wine in all cases to be given

to the people,) and he only put it into some better order, with *a few inconsiderable alterations made in it*; so that any impartial reader of antiquity will find the whole church at Mass in the fourth and fifth centuries, and a crowd of venerable witnesses to attest it."

Thus you have an express admission of what I have been endeavoring to prove, that your celebration of Mass now is very far from the original mode of celebration. It is of these, what Manning calls "inconsiderable alterations," we complain, by which the entire scope and tendency of the sacrament have been perverted. Manning says, "The substance or essence of the Mass consists precisely in being an unbloody sacrifice offered to God by the priests of the new law, upon the altar, or, what amounts to the same, an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine." Surely our Lord, or his holy apostles, teach no such doctrine, as we have shown before. There is no more sacrifice for sin, St. Paul tells us, since the great finished and complete sacrifice on Calvary. Heb. ix. 28, x. 18. The Lord's Supper was commemorative, as reminding us of what our divine Redeemer had done for us, and was to be continued as he had appointed until his coming again. Manning next makes a most important admission, confirmatory of what we have been saying all through—"That as to the ceremonies, they belong only to the decency or solemnity, but are no part of the substance of the Mass; and, therefore, as *they were gradually introduced in the primitive ages*, so, if the church thought fitting, she might even now make alterations in them."

Here is a full admission of the truth of what we have been stating in the preceding pages—that the composition of your Mass now, is very different from what it was when called the "Lord's Supper." Ceremony after ceremony was added—new doctrines were introduced into the prayers; so that at length we have it, as it is at present, a complete piece of patchwork, and even the parts of this patchwork not arranged in any order, or harmonizing with each other.

We may now perceive the reason why the Mass has not been translated since it assumed its present form. The Latin is not a living language, and consequently its glaring inconsistencies have not been perceived by the people, and have been studiously kept from their knowledge ; for, as for those translations which are placed in your hands, they are only translations of parts of the Mass ; a considerable portion remains concealed in the Latin, untranslated ; and as for the rubrics, which give directions about your multiplied and absurd forms and ceremonies, you are left in utter ignorance respecting them.

The old Roman ritual differed most essentially from the state into which it was altered by Gregory the Great, as he is styled in your church ; and although Manning admits that your present Mass may be altered and restored to its primitive state, by being divested of those inconsistent and contradictory patchwork additions which were subsequently gradually introduced, and some of them imposed by force upon the people, as we learn from church history, yet this is a reformation your church never will concede. It was the insisting upon this being done—that the forms and ceremonies of the church should be restored to their primitive state ; it was the insisting that no doctrines should be admitted or entertained, but such as were sanctioned and taught by the inspired apostles in the Holy Scriptures, which brought down the vengeance of the apostate Church of Rome upon all who presumed to raise their voices against her numerous heresies. *To reform, she never will, never can consent.* Her infallible counsels have sent forth certain decrees, have pronounced certain anathemas, against all those who refuse to submit to her usurped authority ; nor can she, without openly compromising her claims to infallibility, retrace her steps, and return to primitive and apostolic usage. The Pope claims to be Christ's vicar upon earth, asserting that our Lord has delegated to him full power and authority over his flock ; and, therefore, that there can be no human tribunal competent to call in

question the laws and rules which he adopts in the government of the church. We have seen in the preceding pages how little sanction this pretended claim of your Popes derives from God's word.

I bring the subject again before your view, only to show you that the *principles* of Protestantism and Romanism are essentially different; and that although they may both hold and do hold the fundamentals of the Gospel in their common belief, yet they arrive at these truths by means of a totally different process—the one takes the Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, for their guide, as interpreted by Scripture itself, which is the best comment upon doctrinal points—the other, your church, refuses to refer to Scripture for that purpose, as being taught to believe implicitly that you have a *living*, a *present* infallible guide which can never lead you astray. The pope and the Roman church can never sanction the study of God's Word for “instruction in righteousness”—can never sanction the belief that it is profitable for “doctrine”—can never admit that, if blessed by the Spirit of God, its use can “make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work,” 2 Tim. iii. 16. Therefore I repeat, until you are determined, with God's assistance, to make use of the reason which he has bestowed upon you, unless you endeavor to ascertain the grounds of those claims by which you are kept under such spiritual thralldom, you will continue forever subjugated and enslaved—your spiritual bondage will never be broken, and you will remain wilfully shutting your eyes to that glorious day-star, that clear and brilliant light which emanates from God's revealed word.

But, you say, as you are taught to do, how can we understand these things? Has not St. Peter told us that there are many things “hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction?” Out of your own mouth you are condemned. You say that the Scriptures are hard to be understood—that persons may wrest those Scriptures to their own destruction; and yet by reference to your

own writers, to those whose authority is admitted by your church, we shall find them endeavoring to prove their claims, endeavoring to establish their doctrines, by *reference to those very Scriptures* which your church teaches you to believe are very insufficient and dangerous guides ! How can you tell but that you misinterpret and misunderstand those very passages ? How can you tell but you wrest them, as in all sincerity we believe you do, to your own destruction ?

Mark, *the unstable* are spoken of as wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction ; alas ! is not your church unstable in the extreme ? Is she now, by your own admission, what she was when Paul addressed his Epistle to the Romans ? Was she the same even seven hundred years after our Lord, when the title of Universal Bishop had been assumed, after Gregory I., who was consecrated bishop of Rome in the year 590, said that “ whosoever used such a title was the forerunner of Antichrist.” At this period also, as we have seen, various changes and innovations had been made in the mode of celebrating the Eucharist—the invocation of saints and angels—the use of relics or holy bones and garments, &c. &c.—prayers for the dead, and other vain and ungodly doctrines were creeping in, though many were raising their voices against them, as we learn when we consult Church History. Let us next advance to the thirteenth century, and now we shall find the popish weeds flourishing most luxuriously in the Lord’s vineyard, and attaining an advance in growth which their first introducers could never have anticipated. The absurd and blasphemous doctrine of transubstantiation, with all its false and wicked accompaniments, was forced upon the people ; and Rome, the Babylon of the Book of Revelation, became deeply stained with the blood of those faithful witnesses who raised their voices for the pure faith of the Gospel. Oh ! it is a heart-rending account to read of the dreadful crusades excited by the pope in those days against all who rebelled against his authority. Entire armies were marched against those falsely called heretics ; and

thus Rome proved her right to appropriate St. John's description to herself: of being "drunk with the blood of the saints," (Rev. xvii. 6.)

Let us advance to the sixteenth century—we find Rome again "unstable;" we find new doctrines, or what you term matters of "discipline," added. The Council of Trent, the last Council held, widened the breach, if possible, more than ever; and your church, Babylon the Great of Scripture, now, my Roman Catholic brethren, stands forth in those enlightened days an unwieldy and tottering structure, assaulted on every side by weapons and engines supplied from God's armory, the Bible, abiding the time when the inspired prophets of God in numerous places declare she will be overthrown and utterly destroyed.

You quote many passages of Scripture, and you say these give support to your system. Surely, Scripture taught by the Holy Spirit, cannot contradict itself; when it apparently does so, that seeming contradiction and difficulty must be caused by your not understanding the meaning aright. What then should you do? Should you have recourse to partial and prejudiced guides, whose interest and profit it is to deceive you? No; you should have recourse to God himself, who has invited you to come to him for the counsel and direction of his Spirit; and be assured, if you sincerely and earnestly solicit advice and assistance, the apparent discord will soon be resolved into harmony, and the agreement in doctrine and faith and practice of the various parts of Scripture will become manifest. Your church inquires triumphantly, does not the reading of the Bible, without due regard to the church's authority, multiply sects and divisions? You inquire, do we not see Protestantism split into numerous sects and parties, all claiming the sanction of the Bible? It is to be lamented that such divisions exist; but there were divisions among the apostles themselves, to some of which we have alluded in the preceding pages. There were ever divisions upon various points in the church; and men with minds constituted as they are, can never be

brought to view all things exactly alike. Why were your numerous councils held, but as an attempt to produce uniformity in belief—and has this succeeded? You have council contradicting council; one repealing what the other has determined.

There are several points upon which your church has pronounced no decision, and upon which you are permitted to entertain various opinions. “The immaculate conception of the Virgin” is one, respecting which there has been the fiercest contention. Even respecting your doctrine of transubstantiation, your own authors differ widely as to the mode of this taking place—some assert one thing, others something different. As to your boasted infallibility, as we before remarked, your authors are not agreed; some placing it in a general council, others in the popes, and others again in popes and councils united. No council has, nor, from the very *nature of the decision*, could determine it.

In your system you have no guide you can safely follow; strange to say, you are deprived of even the Scriptures, *which you admit to be God's own word*, by the authority of your church, for so unnecessary does she consider them to uphold your system, or rather so hostile to her professed doctrines and principles does she *know* them to be, that they are suffered to remain locked up in the Latin language; and those various translations which you have, possess no weight, no authority, but must be considered as the workmanship of private individuals, and not of the church at large, which never officially approved of any of them.

The first symptoms of doubt expressed by you respecting the competence of your professing guides, are at once endeavored to be repressed. The moment you intimate to your confessors the least suspicion of the truth of your church, your inquiries are silenced, and you are told you are committing mortal sin to allow your thoughts to wander upon forbidden ground.

But Protestants do not differ as widely as you imagine. There are certain matters of discipline, such as church government, upon which many conceive the inspired

apostles have not pronounced decisively, hence men imagine that upon these points freedom of opinion is permitted ; and however we may lament disunion and division, surely it is better than to have the minds and consciences of men so fettered that where even fundamental error is proposed, they are forced to assent to it, even against their conscientious convictions. How, your Church has inquired, will you convince from Scripture a Unitarian, that the interpretation which he gives to a passage of Scripture, which apparently states the inferiority of the Son to the Father, is not correct. Why has not he, you ask, as just a claim to interpret its meaning according to his views, as you have ? Where is the judge ? Who is to decide ? We answer, the Word of God itself. It is not by reference to insulated texts that we are to arrive at truth. By adopting this plan, error and heresy have uniformly spread ; but, by Divine assistance, endeavoring to view the Scriptures as a whole, to ascertain the scope and design of God in giving us a revelation of his will, and of the nature of that will, and by comparing other passages together, thus to arrive at the truth. This we can do, so far as the essentials of the Gospel are concerned, and nothing can be more express and plain than the teaching of the Scriptures themselves upon this subject. Of this we have, in the preceding pages, given you many instances ; thus the Unitarian can be shown those passages, those numerous passages which speak of Jesus as God, which give him worship as God ; hence, then, he may learn that the contradiction is only apparent—the one number of passages speaking of him as God, the others as man ; both of which the Lord Jesus was. And so powerful and so numerous are those passages ; so utterly inconsistent with the Unitarian views are the scope and design of God's word, that, in order to reconcile it to their principles, they have expunged large portions of the Bible and also given the most erroneous translations—endeavoring not to make their views agree with Scripture, but to pare away part, and mould the remainder into a shape corresponding with their false and corrupt principles.

Your church teaches that the priest can bring the body and blood of our Lord upon your altar. The Catechism of the Council of Trent says "De sac Eucharistæ." But now the pastors must here explain that not only the true body of Christ, and whatsoever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as the bones and nerves, (*veluti ossa et nervos,*) but also that entire Christ is contained in this sacrament, and yet we hear St. Paul saying, 2 Cor. v. 15, 16, "And Christ died for all, that they also who live may not now live to themselves, but to him who died for them and rose again. Wherefore, because Jesus rose from the dead, henceforth we *know no man according to the flesh.* And if we have known Christ according to the flesh, but now we know him so no longer." Can any thing be more clearly contradictory of the above passage, which professes to explain the nature of Christ's presence upon the altar, extracted from the Catechism of the Council of Trent!

When Jesus wished to prove to his disciples that his body was really present before them after his resurrection, and before his ascension to the right hand of God his Father, he says, Luke xxiv. 39—"Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Here our Lord appeals to two of the senses of his disciples—sight and touch. You are not permitted to use either. You see neither his flesh nor his bones, but a little round wafer made of flour and water. Nor are you suffered to handle it, this you are expressly prevented from doing by its being placed upon your tongues; and yet your Church calls upon you to believe that his body is before you. You are taught to distrust the efficacy of our Lord's intercession, and to suppose that you require other intercessors to assist in offering up your prayers—when Jesus himself tells you that his advocacy and his merits alone are sufficient, and that "whatsoever we ask the Father in his name, that we shall receive," John xvi. 23, 24. You are also taught to offer up the most blasphemous prayers to the Virgin, and to other saints. The Virgin is called, in one of the prayers in the breviary, used upon September 9, "Spes

*unica peccatorum, &c.,*" the only hope of sinners, "by thee we hope for pardon, and in thee, most blessed, is the expectation of our rewards."

I could easily multiply instances of these wicked and unscriptural prayers to a very great extent, but I confine myself to your Mass.

You entirely change the design and object of the Supper of the Lord. But you will here answer, Have we not the authority of the Church? Does not our Lord say, "that we are to consider him who does not hear the Church as a heathen man and a publican?" Matt. xviii. 17. Yes, our Lord does say so. Now I will not assume that our Lord is only here speaking concerning *those private dissensions and disputes*, which the members of the Christian community to which both parties belong, have a right to settle, and not of any grave matters of doctrine, respecting which there may be a difference in opinion. I will assume that the Church has authority, and I will show you from the verse following in whom that authority was to centre. "Amen," saith our Lord, "I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." Thus we see that the authority of binding and loosing was delegated or intrusted to the Apostles, who, as we have so often observed in the preceding pages, were guided by the Holy Ghost in their decisions, and were prevented from committing any matter to writing but that which obtained the sanction of our Lord himself.

In the New Testament, therefore—the inspired composition of Christ's holy Apostles—we have our rule of faith; his Church, or assemblage of the faithful believers in him, was to be governed by this authority. Where was the Church of Rome at this time? Where was the Pope of Rome? Where were your infallible decrees? Where were all your contradictory forms and ceremonies? Were they taught by the Apostles—were they sanctioned by our Lord? We find no traces of any such in the sacred records. The same way of

salvation was at the beginning which is now ; and that way was taught by our Lord's Apostles, orally or by word of mouth, after his ascension ; and was by them afterwards committed to writing, and those writings were collected together and circulated, to prevent false doctrines being imposed upon the people as truth.

If we hear the Church of Christ, if we obey the Church of Christ, we must disobey the Church of Rome. If we follow the teaching of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, as set forth in the writings of his servants, we must reject the teaching of your Church, for the one is contrary to the other. Why does the Roman Catholic Church object to the writings of the holy Prophets and Apostles being read and consulted by you, but because she well knows that her doctrines are not to be found there ? She never will, nor she never can, notwithstanding all her professions about permitting you to read the Scriptures—an outward consent extorted from her by the increase of knowledge and independence in these free Protestant countries—cordially suffer you to do so. And see the restrictions she lays upon you—she may in certain cases permit you to read them, but she fetters your judgment, she chains up your intellect, and she requires from you the most implicit and unreserved submission to the authority of the Church. Thus she seeks to neutralize the very object and design of the Scriptures being given ; and by a false but craftily designed show of liberality, to keep you still in the most degrading bondage and superstition. She objects, and consistently too, to the use of the Holy Scriptures by the youth of the land in schools, well convinced that to the unbiased and unprejudiced minds of children, this study must be especially injurious to her interests. Choose, therefore, between both teachers : the Apostles, or your Roman Church. What motive could the Apostles of our Lord have in deceiving you ?—the Church of Rome has many. May the Lord direct and guide you, and lead you in the right way.

I have endeavored, I trust, to avoid all unnecessary

cause of offence, and to show you the dangerous state in which you are while following false teachers, and have directed you to that sacred volume from whence, with the Divine blessing, you can obtain all necessary information.

There are several other erroneous and antisciptural tenets which you are called upon to believe, and which the design of this present work does not suffer me to notice. For all these you will find a remedy in the writings of our Lord's inspired Apostles; to them, therefore, I refer you, and earnestly pray that their words may be blessed to your souls.

I shall now proceed to give a brief statement of part of your system, of which the Roman laity know very little—I mean what are called in your Roman Missals, "Defects in the Mass." The title of this part in the beginning of the Missal is—"DE DEFECTIBUS IN CELEBRATIONE MISSARUM OCCURRENTIBUS."

*Translation.*

DEFECTS OCCURRING IN THE CELEBRATION OF THE MASSES.

We have said much about the absurdities and antisciptural practices of your church at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which she has called the Mass; but the most extraordinary part of her system is, that, after having most authoritatively pronounced that the body and blood, with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is upon the altar, or in the priest's hands, (see creed of Pope Pius IV.;) and after having compelled you to fall down and worship the host as such, your infallible church teaches that there are many circumstances which may occur, and which do frequently occur, which will prevent this change taking place: so that you will only adore a little round wafer made of flour and water, and a little common wine! You may start at this, but it is no invention of mine; the church to which you belong has, at the commencement of the Missal, inserted these several cases, to which you can at once refer. It does appear to me to be one of the strongest arguments against the preposterous claims of

your church to infallibility, that you are left, when you attend your place of worship, in doubt as to whether, upon your own principles, you are worshipping the Saviour in the transubstantiated elements, or are guilty of the most debasing idolatry.

The following are some of the instructions given by your church to your officiating priests. You will find them at the beginning of the Missal used by the priest at Mass :—

R.—*Sacerdos celebraturus omnem adhibeat diligenciam ne desit aliquid ex requisitis ad sacramentum Eucharistiae conficiendum. Potest autem defectus contingere ex parte materiae consecrandae, et ex parte formae adhibendae, et ex parte ministri conficientis. Quicquid enim horum deficit, scilicet materia debita, forma cum intentione et ordo Sacerdotalis in conficiente non conficitur sacramentum. Et his existentibus quibuscumque aliis deficientibus, veritas adest sacramenti. Alii vero sunt defectus qui in Missae celebratione occurrentes, etsi veritatem sacramenti non impedian, possunt tamen aut cum peccato, aut cum scandalo, contingere.*

T.—The priest who is about to celebrate Mass, must use all diligence, lest any of those things be wanted which are requisite for the perfecting the sacrament of the Eucharist. A “defect” can happen on the part of the materials about to be consecrated, on the part of the form to be made use of, and on the part of the officiating priest ; for whichever of these are wanting, namely, the proper materials, the form with the intention, and the priestly order in the person officiating, the sacrament is not perfected. But if these several things are there, whatever other matters may be wanting, the true sacrament is present. But there are other defects, which occur in the celebration of the Mass ; and although they do not impede the truth of the sacrament, yet are attended with sin and scandal.

In these instructions given to your priests, you perceive that there are four distinct classes of defects, and that any of these will vitiate the sacrament, or prevent

the transubstantiation taking place. These four classes refer—

- 1.—To the materials of the bread and the wine.
- 2.—To the form used in the consecration of the elements.

3.—To the intention of the officiating priest.

4.—The priestly order of the person who celebrates. With respect to the first class, we read as follows :

*De defectibus materiae.*

T.—Concerning the *defects of the material.*

Defectus ex parte materiae possunt contingere, si aliquid desit ex iis, quae ad ipsam requiruntur, requiritur enim ut sit panis triticeus et vinum de vite, et ut hujusmodi materia consecranda in actu consecrationes sit coram sacerdote.

T.—Defects with respect to the material can occur, if any thing be wanting of those which are required for its composition ; for it is required that the bread should be made of wheat, and the wine from the vine or grape ; and also that the material of the kind about to be consecrated, should in the act of consecration be before the priest.

*De defectu panis.*

T.—*The defect of the bread.*

Si panis non sit triticeus, vel si triticeus admixtus sit granis alterius generis in tanta quantitate ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel si aliqui corruptus, non conficitur sacramentum.

T.—If the bread be not made of wheat, or if made of wheat it be mixed with grains of another kind of corn in so large a quantity as not to remain wheaten bread, or if it be otherwise corrupted, the sacrament is not perfected.

See now the position in which you are placed. You know nothing of the composition of the wafer—you have not seen it made ; and yet you are told, upon the authority of your infallible Church, that if it be not made of wheat, or if there be too large a mixture of other corn,

that the words of consecration go for nothing, and that *no change into the body of our Lord takes place*; as if the power of God were limited to the change only of wheaten bread into the body of our Lord. Surely if it be true in the one case, it must be true in the other. If it be false in the one case, it must be false in the other. And yet your church instructs you, that you can never be certain, notwithstanding all the prayers, crossings, sprinklings, incensing, &c. &c., that the body of our Lord is present at all; but that you may, and for aught you know to the contrary often do, kneel down and adore nothing but a cake of bread. I have said sufficient to prove to you that no change takes place in any case; that let the composition of the wafer or wine be what it may, it still remains the same in substance and properties, or "accidents," as your church terms them; and that our Lord merely used bread, not for the purpose of becoming his body, but of *representing* his body.

The next passage in the list of defects contains a strange and startling declaration for an infallible church to make.

Si sit confectus de aqua rosacea, vel alterius distillationis, *dubium est*, an conficiatur.

T.—If the bread be made with rose-water, or with any other distilled water, it is *doubtful* whether the sacrament is perfected.

So you see that your infallible church, with, as you assert, our Lord's vicar, the pope, at its head, cannot decide in this particular instance. And you know not what you worship, whether the Lord Jesus or bread; and if you ask the priest, he is equally ignorant; and if you go to the pope for information, he can give you none. Now, really, I conceive that this passage *alone* should be sufficient to shake your confidence in your guides, when they acknowledge that they cannot tell you whether you are worshipping God or bread. See the consequences of your unscriptural and absurd doctrines!

There are some other rubrics or directions under this class which I shall pass over, however unmeaning and

foolish they appear; but the seventh I cannot refrain from giving you.

Si hostia consecrata dispareat vel casu aliquo ut vento aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta et nequeat reperiri tunc altera consecretur ab eo loco incipiendo. "Qui pridie quam pateretur," facta ejus prius oblatione ut supra.

T.—If the consecrated host disappears either by some accident, as being blown away by the wind, or by some miracle, or taken away by some animal and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated, beginning with the words in that place—"Who the day before he suffered;" having first made the oblation as above.\*

When first I read this rubric I was perfectly astonished; in fact, I cannot find words to express my utter amazement, how any Christian body of men, professing to acknowledge the sacred Scriptures as God's Word, could publish such blasphemy as that the body of our Lord, accompanied, as you teach, by his soul and divinity, could be blown away by the wind, could be carried off and eaten by a dog, a cat, a rat, or a mouse. One of the most forcible arguments put forward in the Bible against the worship of idols, is that they cannot help or defend themselves—that they have no sense of feeling, no strength. These arguments are used in many parts of Scripture: 1 Sam. v. 4; Isaiah xliv. 17, xl. 18, xlv. 20; Jer. x. 5; Jer. xiv. 22, li. 18; Psalm cxv. 2; and yet here you teach that our Lord cannot

\* We have here a wilful mistranslation of the words of Holy Scripture. It is stated that *the day* before our Lord suffered, "Pridie," "he took bread," &c., that is, instituted the Last Supper. This your church states, in order to justify your having Mass only in the morning, and as an encouragement to her rules of fasting which she enforces, before the priest celebrates Mass, and which could not be adhered to until the evening. It was *the night* before he suffered that the Last Supper was instituted. How can your church justify herself in thus altering the expressions of God's word to suit her own corrupt and novel views? We gave a similar instance before as to her placing the word "all" in our Lord's command to his disciples to eat the bread. St. Paul tells you (1 Cor. ii. 23) that it was "at night the Supper was instituted." St. Mark also (xiv. 17) says it was evening. St. Matthew (xxvi. 20) also says the same.

protect his own body, but that it may be carried off and eaten as above mentioned. Be assured, when this rubric was first appointed, the doctrine of transubstantiation was unknown. It was merely upon the supposition that the bread remained bread ; and this we give you as an additional proof of the novelty of this article of your creed. I gladly hasten from such a subject, so derogatory of the power and dignity of the Godhead.

We now come to consider the “*Defects of the Wine.*”

Si vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis seu non maturis expressum, vel ei admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur sacramentum.

T.—If the wine has become entirely sour, or altogether putrid, or made of sour or unripe grapes, or mixed with so much water that the wine is corrupted, the sacrament is not perfected ; (that is, as was observed before, no transubstantiation takes place.)

Now, how is this to be ascertained, whether the wine has been made of unripe grapes, or mixed with too much water ? Surely you, the members of the congregation, have no means of knowing the state of the wine ; pure, unadulterated wine, the real juice of the grape, is most difficult to be obtained. You are not allowed to taste it ; but when the chalice is raised up before you, you must kneel and worship you know not what. You cannot tell whether the change has taken place. At your ordinary stations, a messenger is frequently sent by the priest for wine to the nearest public house. You cannot tell, nor can the priest, how this wine has been adulterated ; and, therefore, you may be called upon to worship only a spurious compound or mixture—a strange subject for worship ! Thus you see to what mistakes you are exposed. There are several other rubrics concerning the wine, but sufficient have been brought before you to show you the uncertain nature of your system.

We come next to a new subject—“*De defectibus formæ,*” or the *defects of form.*

Defectus ex parte formæ possunt contingere si aliquid desit ex iis, quæ ad integratatem verborum in ipsa consecratione requiruntur. Verba autem consecrationis, quæ sunt forma hujus sacramenti sunt hæc, “ Hoc est enim corpus meum ;” et “ Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et æterni testamenti mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.” Si quis autem aliquid diminueret, vel immutaret de forma consecrationis corporis et sanguinis, et in ipsa verborum immutatione verba idem non significarent, non conficeret sacramentum. Si vero aliquid adderit, quod significationem non mutavit, conficeret quidem sed gravissime peccaret.

T.—Defects in respect of “form” can arise, if any of those words are wanting which are required for the completion of the words which make the consecration. The words which constitute “the form” of this sacrament are as follow—“ For this is my body,” and “ For this is the chalice of my blood of the New and Eternal Testament which shall be shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins.” But if any person shall diminish or change any thing of the “form” of consecration of the body and of the blood, and if in this change of the words, the words substituted do not signify the same, the sacrament is not perfected. But if any person adds any thing which does not change the signification or meaning, he perfects the sacrament, but at the same time he is guilty of very great sin.\*

Now, remember the words of consecration are repeated in a very low voice ; you have, therefore, as you cannot hear them, no possible means of knowing whether they are correctly repeated or not, or whether the priest is guilty of such omissions or additions in the words as to vitiate the transubstantiation. Thus you perceive here again you are left in doubt ; you worship, for aught

\* We cannot refrain from expressing our regret here that your church has not been upon all occasions equally careful to follow the exact words of Holy Scripture. In the preceding note, “upon the rubric which directs what is to be done in case of the consecrated host being carried off,” we have alluded to two remarkable instances of *wilful* change.

you know to the contrary, upon your own grounds, wafer or a piece of bread composed of flour and water, and common wine, and this your church imperatively commands you to do, though she tells you at the same time that you never can be certain as to the real nature of what she compels you to adore; and you blindly submit to this tyranny, though, if you exercised your reason and your judgment, you would, from this very circumstance, derive sufficient cause to throw off her yoke altogether.

There are some other rubries on this subject of "form," but sufficient extracts have been brought before you; we now proceed to consider another species of Defects.

#### De defectibus ministri.

Concerning the *defects of the officiating priest.*

Defectus ex parte ministri, possunt contingere quoad ea quae in ipso requiruntur. Hæc autem sunt—In primis intentio; deinde dispositio animæ; dispositio corporis, dispositio vestis mentorum, dispositio in ministerio ipso, quoad ea, quæ in ipso possunt occurrere.

T.—Defects on the part of the officiating priest or minister may happen with respect to those things which are required in himself personally. These are, in the first place, intention; 2dly, disposition of mind; 3dly, disposition of body; 4thly, disposition of vestments; 5thly, disposition in the ministration itself as to those things which can occur during its performance.

#### De defectu Intentionis.

Of the *defect of Intention.*

Si quis non intendit confieere sed delusorie aliquid agere. Item si aliqua Hostia ex oblivione remaneant in altari vel aliqua pars vini, vel aliqua Hostia lateat, eum non intendat consecrari nisi quas vidit. Item si quis habeat coram se undecim Hostias et intendat consecrare solum decem non determinans quas decem intendit in his easibus *non consecrat* quia requiratur intentio.

T.—1. If any priest does not intend or design to

complete the sacrament, or to transubstantiate. 2. In like manner, if any hosts from forgetfulness remain upon the altar. 3. If any part of the wine or any hosts lie concealed, where he only intends to consecrate those he sees. 4. Likewise, if the priest has before him eleven hosts, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining which ten, in these cases he does not consecrate, that is, no transubstantiation takes place, because his intention is wanting.

Here you have evidence how entirely dependent you are upon the will of your priest. They need never give you what they teach you is the body and blood of our Lord, and thus a parish priest who wished to punish you, can, during the entire time of his ministration, deceive you by causing you to worship the untransubstantiated wafers and wine. We could enlarge upon the consequences of this most monstrous and absurd doctrine; in fact, such would unsettle the whole of Christianity, because intention is taught by your church, not only to be necessary in the sacrament of the Eucharist, but in all your other six—baptism, holy orders, and the others, none of which, upon this principle, can you be sure of being rightly administered. If this doctrine be true, our Lord has suffered in vain, for he has left his people to the will and intention of his erring servants, some of whom, as is asserted in the above-quoted rubric, may wish to deceive. And it is quite clear, if a priest does not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, which many of them, who have left the Roman Church, give convincing proofs that they do not, this change cannot take place, and you become guilty of the most degrading idolatry. It is vain you say, the fault is the priest's not ours—that your intention is sincere. Where is your authority for worshipping the host at all! Scripture does not teach you to do so; the practice of the ancient churches is against you, and if you by modern inventions, and the introduction of "will-worship," voluntarily entangle yourselves in falsehood and error, you have only to abide by the consequences.

Can any thing be more absurd than what is said about

the ten hosts ; of one of them, or of some of the wine, lying concealed, and thus not being changed into the body and blood of our Lord ? Surely all these consequences would be avoided by retaining the primitive practice of having a loaf, and from that loaf, consecrated by prayer to God, breaking off pieces and giving them to the faithful.

*Si sacerdos putans se tenere unam Hostiam, post consecrationem invenerit fuisse duas simul junctas, in sumptione sumat simul utramque.*

T.—If the priest, supposing that he holds one host, after consecration finds that there are two joined together, let him take and eat them both at the proper time together.

Here is another instance of the confusion produced by this antisciptural and irrational doctrine. Does the priest eat two bodies or one body ? or if there are a number of consecrated hosts heaped together, do they all then become only one body, and as they are separated do the bodies distinctly and separately multiply without a new form of consecration. Surely this rubric must have been ordained before transubstantiation was introduced. The more you examine this doctrine by its consequences, the more unintelligible it becomes. There are several other regulations equally extraordinary upon this subject, but we have not space to mention them all.

*De defectibus dispositionis animæ.*

*Of the defects of the disposition of mind.*

*Si quis suspensus, excommunicatus, degradatus, irregularis, vel alias canonice impeditus celebret, conficit quidem sacramentum sed gravissime peccat, tam propter communionem, quam indigne sumit, quam propter executionem ordinem, quæ sibi erat interdicta.*

T.—If any priest, being suspended, excommunicated, degraded, or irregular, or under any other canonical impediment, celebrates Mass, he perfects the sacrament, but he is guilty of very heinous sin, as well on account of the communion which he outwardly partakes of, as

on that of the exercise of the office of holy orders, which he was forbidden to use.

There are several other rubries upon the same subject.

How, we inquire in sober seriousness, is it to be supposed for a moment that such a character as that described above, could ever receive power from God to change the wafer and wine into the body and blood of the Lord Jesus, to hold him in his hands, and to treat that body and that blood perhaps with the greatest indignity? We cannot conceive it to be possible. Jesus once suffered humiliation; but that is now over. When he comes upon earth again, it will be with power and majesty, to reward his faithful servants, and to inflict his judgments upon those who rejected his authority, as set forth in the inspired writings of his prophets and apostles. By this doctrine you may perceive that once a priest, always a priest; and that the ministrations of any priest who may have rejected the errors of your church, and joined another creed, are, upon this principle, equally efficacious as those who still remain in subjection to her authority.

De defectibus dispositionis corporis.

Concerning the *defects of disposition of body.*

Si quis non es jejunus post mediam noctem, etiam post sumptionem solius aquæ, vel alterius potus aut cibi per modum etiam medicinæ, et in quantumcumque parva quantitate, non potest communicare nec celebrare.

If any priest is not fasting from midnight, even after the taking of water only, or of any other drink or food by way of medicine, and let the quantity be ever so small, still he can neither communicate nor celebrate Mass.

Here, again, you are left subject to the negligence or mistake of the priest as to the hour of midnight; and you are told by your infallible church that the priest can neither communicate nor celebrate Mass if the smallest portion of food or drink has been partaken of after that time; notwithstanding, as we before showed, that

it was after supper that the Eucharist was originally given and celebrated by our Lord himself. Where did your Church of Rome thus receive authority to unsay and to forbid what the everlasting Head of the Church, the chief Shepherd himself, allowed and sanctioned by his own example ?

2.—*Si autem ante medium noctem cibum aut potum sumpserit, etiam si post modum non dormierit, nec sit digestus, non peccat, sed ob perturbationem mentis, ex qua devotio tollatur, consulitur aliquando abstinendum.*

T.—But if before midnight the priest shall partake of food or drink, even although he has not slept after, nor is it digested, yet he does not sin ; but on account of the disturbance of his mind, by reason of which his devotional spirit is taken away, it is better for him to abstain for some time before.

3.—*Si reliquiæ cibi remanentes in ore transglutiantur non impediant communionem, cum non transglutiantur per modum cibi, sed per modum salivæ. Idem dicendum si lavando os deglutiatur stilla aquæ, præter intentionem.*

T.—If the fragments of food remaining in the mouth are swallowed, they do not prevent communion, provided they are not swallowed as food, but only as saliva or spittle. The same is to be said if a drop of water be swallowed in the washing the mouth unintentionally.

Can any thing be more absurd than this ridiculous trifling upon the most solemn subjects, giving thus undue importance to matters of no consequence whatever ; inventing and laying down rules which were never so much as thought of in the ancient church ; distracting the mind, which should be occupied with the most spiritual contemplations, and giving low, degrading notions of the Blessed Sacrament, and making its efficacy consist in an adherence to outward forms ?

It would occupy too much space to bring before you many other rubrics and directions as to how the priest is to act when particular circumstances occur. As, for instance, what is to be done should the host be discov-

ered to be broken ; again, should the host, after consecration, fall into the chalice ; again, should the blood of our Lord in winter become frozen ; again, should any of it fall to the ground. All these instances are especially provided against ; and thus we are taught an additional proof of the comparative novelty of your boasted transubstantiation, as, surely, such absurdities, such trifling, could never have been tolerated upon the supposition of Jesus himself being there present, body, blood, soul, and divinity, and apparently unable to assist or protect himself. We also learn from the rubric of what is to be done in case of the spilling of the blood, that when this charge or direction was given, the church knew nothing of your modern doctrine of concomitances, or that both body and blood were united under one species.

There is one rubric more which I cannot refrain from giving you, though I do so with regret, as such a rubric is calculated to bring contempt upon the Blessed Sacrament. However, as it does exist, and as cases to which it applies must have occurred, I think it better to do so, for the purpose of showing you more clearly the delusive nature of your system, and, with God's blessing, persuading you to provide a remedy :

Si sacerdos evomat Eucharistiam, si species integræ appareant, reverenter sumantur, nisi nausea fiat. Tunc enim species consecratæ caute separantur, et in aliquo loco sacro reponantur, donec corruptantur et postea in sacrarium projiciantur. Quod si species non appareant comburatur vomitus, et cineres in sacrarium mittantur.

T.—Should the priest vomit forth the Eucharist, if the species appear whole and entire, let him swallow them again, unless his stomach sickens against it. In such case, let the consecrated species be cautiously separated from whatever else he has vomited forth, and let them be laid up in some holy place until they are corrupted,\*

\* In the sixteenth Psalm, v. 10, quoted by St. Peter, (Acts iii. 27,) God declares he will not suffer his Holy One to see corruption. Compare this passage with many of your rubrics, and reconcile them if you

and after that let them be cast forth into the sacristy. But if the species do not appear, let the entire vomit be burnt, and let the ashes be cast into the sacristy.

How to speak on this wretched subject—to find language sufficiently strong to describe the feelings which should be aroused when we read this rubric, I know not. Can you, after reading the above passage, believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation? When you see that which you have worshipped—that which you have adored as God, lying in such a state, the minute description of which is too loathsome—too disgusting to enter upon—surely your natural reason must show you that the King of kings and Lord of lords, by whom the heavens and all the hosts of them were created and formed, could never be placed under such circumstances. When upon earth, he suffered humiliation the most extreme, ignominies of the most debasing description; but see how, all through, his character and divinity shone forth. The declaration of the dying malefactor; the confession of the centurion who guarded him on the cross; the rending of the rocks; the supernatural darkness; the opening of the graves, all proclaimed, with voices which never can be silenced, that Jesus was the Son of God; that his humiliation was voluntary, and only for a time, to accomplish that for which he came into the world, namely, the salvation of sinners. But, brethren, only imagine the scene represented in the above-mentioned rubric—look to the wretched, we say the blasphemous doctrine as portrayed in the above picture, which your church has invented to aggrandize herself, and, we ask, how can you hereafter come before the judgment-seat of that same Jesus, whom you have insulted, and, by your system, endeavored to degrade and degrade? I leave the answer of this question to your own consciences. May the Lord direct you to form a right judgment.

can. The truth is, your entire system is opposed to the teaching of God in his own word.

I have now fulfilled what I proposed at the commencement of this work to demonstrate :—1. That the Mass is opposed to God's own word. 2. That as now celebrated by you, it is entirely different from the preaching of the primitive and early Christian Church : and 3. That one part contradicts another part, and that there is abundance of internal evidence in it, that many of your present forms and prayers preceded the invention and introduction of several of your favorite doctrines.

To the Lord's guidance and direction may we all commit ourselves. May he lead us in the right way, and direct us to him, the only name under heaven given us whereby we can be saved, even Jesus Christ our Lord, and only mediator and advocate with the Father. Amen.

THE END.

WM

4







**THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT**

**This book is under no circumstances to be  
taken from the Building**

NOV 14 1918

